UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Colonial Land and Emigration Commission

By
FRED H. HITCHINS

A Thesis in History

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

PHILADELPHIA
1931

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41550001_0006

The Colonial Land and Emigration Commission

The Colonial Land and Emigration Commission

1840-78

By
FRED H. HITCHINS

A Thesis in History

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Pennsylvania in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

PHILADELPHIA
1931

Copyright 1931
University of Pennsylvania Press
Printed in the United States of America

To
MOTHER

PREFACE

THE great outward movement of population which is one of the phenomena of British history in the XIX century may be studied from several different points of view. First, there is the economic and social background, the driving force behind the movement; secondly, there is what may be termed the political aspect, the attitude and policy of the British and colonial governments; thirdly, there is the actual process of emigration; and finally, the colonial background, the effects of the movement upon the colonies (and other lands). The present study is concerned with part of the second and third viewpoints. A great deal has been written upon the emigration of the XIX century, but mainly from the colonial angle. Few of these writers seem to be aware that there was in existence, in the years 1840 to 1878, a bureau of the government which stood between the Colonial Office and the emigrant, and which, so far as emigration was concerned, *was* in fact the Colonial Office. That bureau is the subject of this thesis.

The discussion may be divided into two parts. The first three chapters deal more particularly with the history of the Commission—the policy of the Colonial Office with respect to emigration in the period prior to 1840, and the persistent propaganda of the Colonial Reformers (Chapter I); the formation of the Emigration Board, its commission and instructions (Chapter II); and finally the organization and personnel of the Board—a sketch of its life (Chapter III).

In the second part the various duties of the Commissioners are treated in turn. First, those functions relating to voluntary emigration—diffusion of information (Chapter IV); administration of the Passengers Acts (Chapter V); supervision of the Emigration Officers (Chapter VI); followed by a brief analysis of the general emigration of the period based upon the annual reports of the Commissioners (Chapter VII). Directly under the control of the Board were the "government emigra-

tion" to the Australian and other colonies (Chapter VIII), and the African, Indian and Chinese emigration to Mauritius and the West Indies (Chapter IX). Miscellaneous duties (lands, legislative review, etc.) are treated in Chapter X. Finally a chapter is devoted to contemporary opinion of the Commission; this criticism is to be found almost entirely in the parliamentary debates of the period.

The study is not, and does not pretend to be, the well-known "last word upon the subject." On the contrary it is but a preliminary survey of what the writer is convinced is a great, but almost unexplored, field; each of the several chapters might well be the subject of a separate research expedition. But in presenting this sketch of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission the author earnestly hopes that it may help to open the way for subsequent extended, and more important, contributions.

To Prof. Landon of the University of Western Ontario, and Professors Lingelbach, Bowden and Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania the writer would like to express his deep appreciation of their unfailing kindness and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface vii

Introduction xi

Chapter I. Emigration Policy and Propaganda, 1815-1840 1

Chapter II. The Colonial Land and Emigration Commission 37

Chapter III. Organization and Personnel 59

Chapter IV. Diffusion of Information 97

Chapter V. Regulation of Emigrant Travel—the Passengers Acts 119

Chapter VI. The Emigration Officers 159

Chapter VII. General Emigration 181

Chapter VIII. Government Emigration 203

Chapter IX. (a) Indian (Coolie) Emigration to Mauritius 235

(b) African, Indian, and Chinese Emigration to the West Indies 242

Chapter X. Colonial Lands and Miscellaneous Duties 267

Chapter XI. Contemporary Criticism of the Commission 281

Conclusion 307

Appendices 315

Bibliography 327

Index 341

INTRODUCTION

THE history of British imperial expansion falls into two great periods divided by the year of the treaty of Versailles. In the first the "old colonial system" held sway. The moving factors in that policy were, first, the ideal of a self-sufficing empire—the desire to get raw materials (principally tobacco, sugar, timber, fish and spices), markets for manufactured goods, and employment for England's great shipping in the trade thus developed—and secondly, rivalry with other states, particularly Spain, Holland and France. In the actual colonial development the state did little;[1] chartered companies did the work. But although the British government was too poor to subsidize these companies to any appreciable extent, it claimed the right to control the development of the colonies, and embodied its policy in the long series of Navigation Acts.

The acquisition of Canada in 1763 marked "the beginning of a new colonial era,"[2] while the fatal year 1783 marked the end of the old. In the new age colonial rivalry was a minor factor; the old bogey of French competition was virtually ended (until 1870). "The period between 1763 and 1870 is the period when British expansion was unhampered. For the first time there was no need to struggle to get and keep a footing as against other nations."[3] Prof. Currey has subdivided British colonial policy since 1783 into three phases. The first is a period of "Centralization," characterised by the rule of Downing Street and "Mr. Mother Country." The old colonial system was still strongly entrenched. The second period is marked by the rise of the Colonial Reformers and the beginning of "Devolution." In the third the colonies expand from

[1]Contrast the policies of the Portuguese, Spanish and French governments.

[2]Knowles, *The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire*, p. 76.

[3]*Ibid.* But it should not be forgotten that in the period 1783-1870 there were occasional flurries of colonial suspicion, if not actual rivalry, *e. g.*, New Zealand in 1839-40.

self-government to federation, and coming of age enter upon an era of "Co-operation" with the mother country through the colonial and imperial conferences. The three periods are distinguished respectively by, first, the mercantile system and centralized control; second, free trade and *laissez-faire;* third, imperial preference and co-operation.[4] The Colonial Land and Emigration Commission extended over the second of these periods; its rise and fall reflect in some respects the changing colonial policy.

In the period of "Centralization" (1783-1837) the British were embittered, disappointed, and disillusioned by the American Revolution. The colonies, it seemed, were destined to cling to the parent for but a short time, and then—to use the old simile—drop like ripe fruit from the tree. Why then should the mother country waste time and money upon them? But not only was there this apathetic attitude towards colonies, there was also a great war, a life-and-death struggle, to preoccupy England for a generation, 1793-1815. Almost unconsciously a new empire was acquired. During these years the House of Commons was comparatively indifferent to colonial affairs; legislation was left largely in the hands of the Colonial Secretary, and he left it to the leading permanent official in the Colonial Office, the never-to-be-forgotten "Mr. Mother Country," who was supposed to be very distrustful of democratic institutions.[5] The governors ruled in the colonies; they in turn were closely restricted by the Colonial Office, so that all authority was centralized in that department, and, practically speaking, in the hands of the Permanent Under-Secretary. Concentration of authority, however, did not mean good government. Colonial lands were recklessly disposed of; every immigrant became a landowner, while labor was con-

[4]Currey, *British Colonial Policy, 1783-1915,* pp. 5-13.

[5]On the truth of this supposition as far as James Stephen was concerned, see Knaplund, "Mr. Oversecretary Stephen," *Journal of Modern History,* I. 40-66.

stantly lacking. On board emigrant ships conditions were terrible, well-nigh unbelievable. Buller's expression of "shovelling out paupers"[6] was not far wrong. The government tried an experiment or two in colonization; they failed. The Navigation Laws still held sway in the economic field. Grievance was added to grievance until "by 1836 the mother country was submerged in a sea of colonial trouble which seriously threatened the stability of her Empire."[7] The centralization policy of the Colonial Office had failed disastrously; throughout the colonies dissension and discontent were rife. Political, social, and economic reforms were imperative if the integrity of the Empire were to be preserved.

But another day was dawning. Apathy disappeared, and thought and attention were again turned to the colonies and colonial development. This change resulted from a combination of factors. The great industrial progress of England in the years after 1815 had brought with it great social problems. The fear of over-population again became general, and was further accentuated by crop failures. The colonies were now looked to as affording some prospect of relief from this danger again (as in 1600) believed imminent. But all of those who now turned their eyes toward the colonies did not see the same things. To some the Canadian rebellion of 1837 demonstrated all too clearly the "insecurity and injustice of colonial government by the mother country, or by local party in connection with the mother country." This political impression was coupled with an economic one. Slavery had been abolished, and as a result the West Indian colonies, apparently, were ruined. Economists had cast aside mercantilism, and now the government under the pressure of the new free-trade doctrines was beginning to reject the old ones piece by piece. Colonies were no longer economic necessities. Further, it seemed that they could no longer be used as penal settlements. In view

[6]Wakefield, *A View of the Art of Colonization* (Collier ed.), p. 490.
[7]Currey, pp. 15-39.

of these changes and with more to come, the sceptics asked on what grounds—political, economic, or social—could empire be justified? Let the colonies go peacefully; there was no advantage to be gained in holding them as colonies. But others, studying the same developments at home and in the colonies, reached directly opposite conclusions. In contrast to the sceptics, these sanguine young men "contemplated a reconstruction and great extension of the British dominion beyond the seas, on principles of internal self-government and commercial freedom." Develop the colonies, and solve their problems and those of the mother country at the same time.[8]

It was the second group, the Colonial Reformers or "Theorists of 1830," men such as Wakefield, Durham, Buller, and Molesworth, who led the new era and pointed out the solutions for the imperial problems—responsible government, systematic emigration, and the sale of lands at a sufficient price. The British Empire had land, labor and capital—use them! Colonize; stop the shovelling out of paupers! Some of their ideas were soon put into practice with certain modifications; land was sold by auction, transportation of convicts was abolished, emigration was placed under supervision, and a certain amount of colonial autonomy was allowed, although this was long viewed with suspicion. Free trade was adopted, the Navigation Acts were repealed. And the integrity of the Empire was preserved.[9]

The economic background of this new colonial era may be analysed somewhat further.[10] It is primarily the history of a great "continental inland expansion in both the Tropics and

[8]Merivale, *Lectures on Colonization and Colonies,* pp. v-vii. The first group (the sceptics) was the "Manchester school," the second the Colonial Reformers.

[9]Currey, pp. 69-105.

[10]This discussion is based upon Professor Knowles's two valuable studies: *The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire* and *The Industrial and Commercial Revolutions in Great Britain during the Nineteenth Century.*

the Temperate regions." Vast new continents were opened up —Canada, Australasia, South Africa, and West and East Africa. So the nineteenth century was one which witnessed "the development of interiors—the moving inland from a port or coast-line to control the land behind, and then the continuous pushing back of the frontier, a process enormously quickened by railways in the last half century."[11] Mechanical transport indeed produced a second Commercial Revolution of far-reaching effect. "The Empire between 1815 and 1850 seemed unpromising, and Englishmen in general . . . expected little from it in the way of economic benefit. . . . The developments of mechanical transport altered that point of view. . . . Instead of being, as old colonies were, either islands or a fringe of people along a coast-line or river, the new Empire consisted of developed continental areas, and included a quarter of the inhabitants of the world linked up by railway and rapid steam communications with the mother country and each other."[12] This new Commercial Revolution provided a medium of rapid communication between all parts of the Empire and linked them closely together; it made the colonies increasingly valuable as markets and sources of raw materials; and finally it created a new desire among the Great Powers to dominate colonial areas. The Revolution also led to great social changes—the growth of towns, the development of a new industrial class of transport workers, an increase in the shop-keeping and trading classes, and a great change in the position of women. Finally, there began a new period of emigration, of both Europeans and Asiatics, with a new government policy towards emigration.[13]

In this new age of emigration the government's policy was one of supervision, advice, and in some cases limited assistance. "In the old colonial days the government looked askance on

[11]Knowles, *Economic Development,* pp. 76-79.
[12]Knowles, *Revolutions,* pp. 179-181.
[13]*Ibid.*

any loss of population. In the nineteenth century Malthus and his theory of overpopulation thoroughly scared the ruling classes, and they were only too ready to sanction [this new attitude towards emigration] so that unemployment should be relieved." For the motives for emigration also had changed in this new era. "Economic and not political or religious reasons were the underlying causes of the nineteenth century racial expansion." Fear of overpopulation,[14] unemployment, poverty, famine, all the social and economic disarrangements resulting from the Industrial Revolution and the enclosures—these were the motives.[15]

Many writers have given descriptions of social conditions in the British Isles in the early nineteenth century—"a vast mass of extreme destitution and abject degradation, by the side of enormous wealth, rapid material progress, national greatness and security."[16] In all the large cities and populous manufacturing districts a very large proportion of the population was living either without any certain means of subsistence, or upon wages utterly inadequate to maintain a decent existence. Thousands were reduced by intemperance, improvidence, and the vices resulting from ignorance and the absence of moral and religious principle, to the standard of the starving beggar and prostitute. This squalid mass of misery, swollen by the continual influx of Irish immigrants, rural laborers in search of employment, and manufacturing operatives reduced to poverty, threatened to sweep away the whole fabric of society. Nor was the evil confined to towns; on the contrary, there was an appalling amount of pauperism in many of the rural districts. On the whole it would appear that not less than a fifth or sixth part of the total population existed in a state of destitution and want, depending in a great measure, either on public or private charity, or on criminal resources, for a

[14]For statistics of population of the British Isles see App. 7.

[15]Knowles, *Economic Development,* pp. 90-92.

[16]Laing, *National Distress; Its Causes and Remedies,* pp. 164-165.

part of their support.[17] This national distress was particularly marked in the years 1837 to 1842, when there were severe depressions of trade and a succession of bad harvests.

The critical economic and social condition of the country had a dual relationship to emigration. It drove men to seek new homes and opportunities across the seas, while at the same time it was generally agreed that one of the remedies for the national distress and economic pressure was to be found in emigration. "Extended colonization is the only practicable means by which we can create expanding fields of employment for the redundant capital and labor which must otherwise melt away and perish through bankruptcy and destitution."[18] The workhouse system was not the appropriate remedy for the social evils; emigration was. The colonies were able to absorb the redundant labor and capital of the United Kingdom; but how were they to be brought together? Many were the different schemes proposed to bring this about, and all were agreed on one point—the government must play the leading rôle. The expense of the various plans need not prove an obstacle, for some, as for instance Colonel Robert Torrens, were prepared to prove "that emigration may be so conducted, as to replace with interest the whole of the expenditure incurred in effecting it, and to aid the finances of the country by opening new and not inconsiderable sources of direct public revenue."[19] All that was needed was the guidance of a master-spirit—a statesman—to direct the plan into operation.

On the other hand the failure of the government to adopt some such plan would have disastrous consequences. In the

[17] *Ibid.* Laing came to the conclusion "that the evils complained of are the natural result and retribution of what may be called a decay in the vital warmth of religious feeling and sense of duty, which showed itself generally throughout European society during the eighteenth century, and in this country [England] took the form of a hard utilitarian selfishness, and inordinate devotion to money."

[18] Torrens, *The Budget,* Letter IV, p. 98.

actual condition of the United Kingdom an extensive, systematic, and self-supporting scheme of colonization was the one thing needful; needful to preserve a due proportion between capital and labor, needful in Ireland to provide for the ejected cottier tenantry, needful in England to provide for the redundant rural population, needful, in short, "to save the country from a servile war."[20]

It was in this setting and as a partial answer to this problem and agitation that the British government established the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission.

[20]Torrens, *Colonization of South Australia*, pp. 302-303. A member of Parliament (Tennant) speaking in 1831 (Feb. 16) said he "thought, that by emigration alone was the country to be saved from a dreadful convulsion." *Hansard,* Third Series, II. 607. There were not wanting from time to time those who maintained that there was no redundant population or labor in the British Isles, but they were few in number and were striving against the tide. Occasionally an English version of "manifest destiny" was to be heard; see Laing, *op. cit.,* pp. 120-121.

I

EMIGRATION POLICY AND PROPAGANDA 1815-1840

IN the days of the old colonial empire emigration was left almost entirely to the enterprise of the individual or of the joint-stock companies exploiting the colonial domain. Only two types of emigration interested the government to any extent. Beginning with the reign of Elizabeth it had turned to overseas emigration as a method of ridding the kingdom of its two classes of undesirables—the paupers and the criminals. Voluntary, free emigration received only occasional attention from the government. It is true that Cromwell, after capturing Jamaica, attempted to colonize it with soldiers and settlers from other colonies,[1] and a century later Halifax was planted as an offset to French power in Acadia; but these were the exceptions. In general English policy was exactly the reverse of that of her great colonial rivals, Spain and France: the English government neither encouraged, actively discouraged, nor regulated voluntary emigration.[2] During the very early period emigration had indeed been welcomed as a relief to the pressure of an apparent over-population which had suddenly appeared (1550-1642), but as this problem adjusted itself, and as mercantilism extended its sway the government turned to disapproval of indiscriminate emigration. Through the eighteenth century "the conscious migration policy of British governments remained what it had become after 1650—to promote the transit of undesirables and foreigners to the colonies, and to give no encouragement to

[1]"This colony was the only one of the old plantations which was planted and developed by Government enterprise from the outset." Belcher and Williamson, *Migration within the Empire,* p. 36. But even here Cromwell used as far as possible "undesirable" elements.

[2]Knowles, *Economic Development,* p. 66.

that of citizens reckoned useful at home."[3] Religious and political irreconcilables, then, constituted a large proportion of the emigrants in the years before the American Revolution. In the colonies could be found, as a rule, a toleration which did not exist in England herself under the régime of the Act of Uniformity and the Test Act.[4] Economic motives for emigration—desire for profit and pressure at home—were never entirely absent, however, and sometimes were dominant.

The American Revolution caused the British government to intervene in the field of colonization to give assistance in the particular case of that group of people known as "United Empire Loyalists."[5] Then emigration dropped into insignificance. The wealthiest colonies remaining to England, the West Indies, were tropical; Canada was not yet regarded as a field for settlement; Australia, just coming into the imperial ken, was at first used only as a receptacle for those convicts who could no longer be transported to the American colonies. On the other hand, the industrial development and expansion, stimulated by war needs, temporarily removed any outward pressure upon the population. Expanding manufactures gave employment to more and more people; the demand for foodstuffs gave encouragement to agriculture; and the royal army and navy took all the recruits it could get or press into service. During this abnormal period there was a lull in emigration. But with the coming of peace and the removal of these unusual stimuli, the United Kingdom was faced with a serious situation; all the great social and economic changes resulting from the Industrial Revolution came more and more into evidence. Under the new pressure outward the volume of emigration

[3]Belcher and Williamson, p. 72. Many of the emigrants prior to 1783 were French Huguenots, Dutch, German, Irish and Scotch-Irish. Even Scotch would be reckoned as foreigners prior to 1707.

[4]"England did not hinder the emigration of any religious or political dissenter." Knowles, *op. cit.*, p. 66. Contrast France and Spain.

[5]Land, seed, food, clothing, and money were offered to them.

from the ports of the United Kingdom increased with startling rapidity in the years after the Congress of Vienna.[6] Renewed interest in the subject led to a period of experimentation, with the British government trying its hand at various schemes in the field of emigration and colonization (1815-1830).

When at the close of the Peninsular War and the general Napoleonic campaigns the regiments were disbanded, great numbers of officers and men left England for the new worlds across the Atlantic and the Pacific. It was with these that the first colonization experiments were made. In 1816 Lieut. Col. Cockburn, at the instance of the War Office, settled some ex-soldiers along the Ottawa River in Upper Canada, to be joined a few years later by some 167 families from Lanarkshire. The settlements were not successful and by 1823 few of the colonists were left.[7] Three years after this War Office experiment parliament passed its first vote for emigration; the sum (£50,000) was expended in the establishment of some 3400 settlers on Algoa Bay at the Cape of Good Hope. Like the Ottawa settlers the Albany ones soon dispersed.[8] After the lapse of four years another experiment was tried. Peter Robinson was authorized by Horton, Under-Secretary of State for

[6]See App. 6. During the breathing-space in the Napoleonic Wars under the Treaty of Amiens, emigration from the British Isles had resumed; most of the emigrants were disbanded soldiers, as the Macdonells. Lord Selkirk who was active at this time received some assistance from the government in the way of land (but not money). See Johnson, *A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America, 1763-1912,* p. 8. It might be noted that of the total British emigration between 1815 and 1840 (1,076,488) one-half proceeded to British North America (532,192); the United States received the bulk of the remainder (458,407). After 1834 emigration to the U. S. always exceeded that to B. N. A.

[7]Johnson, p. 227.

[8]Belcher and Williamson, pp. 99ff. Miss Cowan rightly describes the parliamentary vote as a sudden measure of relief, and not an indication of definite decision on the issues at stake. *British Emigration to British North America, 1783-1837,* p. 56. *Hansard,* First Series, XL. 1549 (July 12, 1819). Two years later (1821) there was a further vote of £68,760 for the Cape and Canadas. *Commons Journals,* LXXVI. 580.

Colonies, to superintend the emigration and settlement of persons from the south of Ireland. On July 1, 1823, he embarked 460 for Upper Canada and the next day 108 more in two vessels chartered with provisions and a doctor. After a passage of eight weeks, during which one woman and eight children died (a very low mortality for the time), the party proceeded to Prescott on the upper St. Lawrence. The settlers were soon located on lands and immediately set about the erection of log houses. A year later Robinson testified: "I feel warranted in stating, that the Emigration to the Province of Upper Canada, committed to my superintendence, has completely succeeded."[9] The favorable beginning of this experiment encouraged the government to send Robinson out again two years later (1825) with another party. He was preparing to organize a third group of emigrants in 1826 when the necessary funds were refused him. Over £160,000 had already been voted for emigration, and the Commons felt that before any further sums were spent, a committee should investigate this vital subject. The outcome of this decision was the appointment of the Emigration Committee of 1826-7.[10]

This parliamentary committee took the first step towards the establishment of an Emigration Commission; it advised that a Board of Emigration should be constituted "under the

[9]Evidence of Robinson, 23 June 1824. *First Report from the Select Committee on the Subject of the Disturbed Districts in Ireland, now under the Provisions of the Insurrection Act,* pp. 441-459 (P.P. #35 (1824).) The government gave free transportation, with provisions for the voyage and for one year after location, and farming utensils. Each male between 18 and 45 (none over 45 was accepted) received 70 acres with a ten-year option on the adjoining 30 acres for £10 sterling. Certain settlement duties were required and an annual quitrent to the Crown. The actual expenses of the experiment at the end of one year were computed to be £11,789. 10. 10½. For the official papers, etc., see C.O. 384/12; 13. In 1823 there was a vote of £15,000 for emigration to the Canadas and the Cape from South Ireland; in 1825 a vote of £30,000 for emigration to the Canadas from South Ireland; and in 1827 a vote of £20,480 for emigration from the United Kingdom. *Commons Journals,* LXXVIII. 590, 422; LXXX. 785; LXXXII. 500.

[10]*Hansard,* Second Series, XVIII. 940. Johnson, p. 232.

direct control of an executive department of the State."[11] Although this recommendation was not carried out, Colonel Cockburn was ordered by Downing Street, January 26, 1827, to survey 300,000 acres of waste land in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and to prepare for the location of 10,000 people. The projects were soon abandoned, however; suitable land could not be found; the settlers would probably be unable to repay their advances in cash; and finally it was feared that the men would be drawn off to the nearby American states.[12]

Another significant event of this period (1815-1830) may be noted. Since the year 1720 there had been placed on the statute books of Great Britain and Ireland a series of laws restricting the emigration of "artificers" and skilled workmen to "foreign parts." These acts may have affected emigration to the United States after 1783, but evasion of them was comparatively easy. Huskisson, while President of the Board of Trade in 1824, secured the repeal of the measures, leaving emigrants free to go whither they would.[13]

"The year 1831 may well be considered a landmark in the history of colonial policy."[14] It was the dawn of a new era, an era made brilliant by Edward Gibbon Wakefield and his little group of "Colonial Reformers."

[11]It also strongly recommended that local authorities assist emigration. Egerton, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy,* p. 281.

[12]Johnson, pp. 18-19. Cockburn's appointment was a result of the First Report of the Committee. Thomas Peel's Swan River settlement in Western Australia (1829) does not seem to have been one in which the home government directly participated, but like the government experiments it did not succeed. See Belcher and Williamson, pp. 110-113; Johnson, p. 232.

[13]Johnson, p. 180. Act 5 Geo. IV, c.97 ("to repeal the Laws relative to artificers going into Foreign Parts"; 21 June 1824) repealed all or parts of the following acts—5 Geo. I, c.27; 23 Geo. II, c.13; 22 Geo. III, c.60; 25 Geo. III, c.67; 39 Geo. III, c.56; and 25 Geo. III (Ireland). At the same time another act legalized trade unions (21 June 1824). This was the beginning of a great reform period.

[14]Egerton, p. 281.

The colonies, especially the new Australian ones, were now beginning to attract more attention. As fields for settlement they were not succeeding. The root of the problem seemed to lie in the system of granting colonial lands. " . . . This source of Imperial wealth had been . . . wasted by improvident Governors and greedy Councils. Rules restricting the amount of grants had been ignored or ingeniously evaded."[15] As a result the colonies, again particularly the new and more distant Australian ones, were faced with great and urgent problems. They were in vital need of two things, capital and labor; the one to promote works of development, the other to do the actual construction. They had a great potential source of revenue in land of almost unlimited quantity, but it was being given away in an extravagant and wholly unsystematic manner. In the mother country were thousands of potential immigrants living in poverty, but there were no funds to finance their passage to the colonies and no organization to regulate such a movement. Lack of labor and capital retarded the economic development of the colonies, while destitution in the towns of England was to a large extent responsible for that lawlessness which fed the system of transportation and retarded their political growth.[16] The problem was obvious: the colonies needed labor, the mother country had a surplus; how was the exchange to be made?

In 1829 while still in prison Edward Gibbon Wakefield, in "A Letter from Sydney," suggested part of the solution to the problem and began his long campaign for "systematic colonization." Released from prison in 1830, he continued the propagation of his views, gathered about himself a number of young men and formed a Colonization Society. This little group of a dozen-odd has won from posterity the name "Colonial Re-

[15]*Ibid.* Prince Edward Island was one of the most notorious examples of the result of the lavish granting of lands, but all the settlement colonies suffered to some degree.

[16]Currey, pp. 57-58.

formers" or "Theorists of 1830."[17] The three necessities of every community are land, labor, and capital; it was upon that basis Wakefield constructed his "system." The great problem was to keep the proper ratio between the three elements. The amount of land available was to be restricted, under Wakefield's plan, by selling it, never giving it away or granting it free; capital was to be supplied with adequate labor by making the price for land so high that immigrants would have to work for wages for some time before they could save enough to become independent landowners; but when they were able to buy land the purchase money was to be used to introduce more laborers. Such a system appeared to be self-operating and self-adjusting. Wakefield first outlined his system as follows:[18]

I. *It is suggested,* That a payment in money of — per acre be required for all future grants of land without exception.

II. That all land now granted, and to be granted, throughout the colony, be declared liable to a tax of — per cent. upon the actual rent.

III. That the proceeds of the tax upon rent, and of sales, form an *Emigration Fund,* to be employed in the conveyance of British Labourers to the colony free of cost.

IV. That those to whom the administration of the Fund shall be entrusted, be empowered to raise money on that security, as money is raised on the security of parish and county rates in England.

[17]There are two biographies of Wakefield, an older one by Garnett, and a recent one by Harrop. "The ideas of the founders of the Colonization Society of 1830," Wakefield said, "grew out of the first proceedings of the British Government in settling the Swan River in Western Australia." (Quoted in Garnett.)

[18]Wakefield, *A Letter from Sydney,* (Everyman ed.), pp. 100-106. Herman Merivale has given a good analysis of the system in his *Lectures* (pp. 387-388). The noted French scholar Leroy-Beaulieu has translated Merivale's summary in his *De la Colonisation chez les Peuples Modernes,* II. 374-375. For other summaries see Buller, *Speech . . . on Systematic Colonization,* pp. 37ff.; Garnett, pp. 62-63; Harrop, p. 53. In 1824 William Charles Wentworth had suggested a system similar to that of Wakefield; a Board of Emigration was to be established to carry out the scheme. Wentworth, *A Statistical Account of the British Settlements in Australia . . . ,* II. 261. See Mills, *The Colonization of Australia,* pp. 134-135.

V. That the supply of Labourers be as nearly as possible proportioned to the demand for Labour at each Settlement; so that Capitalists shall never suffer from an urgent want of Labourers, and that Labourers shall never want well-paid employment.

VI. That, in the selection of Emigrants, an absolute preference be given to young persons, and that no excess of males be conveyed to the colony free of cost. . . .

This was the essence of the Wakefield system or theory.

Theories and arguments were all very well; actual experiment alone could truly test their value, and to that end the Reformers spared no efforts. But Wakefield's "theory as a whole had never a fair trial."[19] The Theorists had to be content with half-measures and partial triumphs. Some colonies were founded ostensibly on Wakefieldian principles; in all the colonies land was no longer granted but sold; in some the proceeds were devoted in part to the assistance of immigration; and a board of supervision was established. But although the stream of emigration flowed faster than before, it was still principally voluntary, unassisted emigration. The chief aim of Wakefield and Buller, "to set up a constant flow of well selected, well directed, emigrants to Canada and Australia," was not fully attained; organized emigration, colonization on a large scale, there was not.[20]

Huskisson, while Colonial Secretary (1827-8), had turned his attention to one of the colonial problems and had planned "to establish a Land Board in London for the management of the Colonial Crown lands."[21] His successor, Sir G. Murray

[19]Egerton, p. 282. In the Canterbury and Otago settlements in New Zealand his ideas were most fully put into practice. See Rusden, *History of New Zealand.*

[20]Wrong, *Charles Buller and Responsible Government,* pp. 63-64. "Whatever may have been Wakefield's own opinion, there can be no question but that the furnishing of an emigration fund was, with practical men, the reason for adopting so much of his theory, as was in a confused and bungling fashion actually adopted." Egerton, p. 285. Canada needed no emigration fund as the spontaneous emigration thither was sufficient; hence no application of the theory was made in the North American colonies.

[21]Egerton, p. 281; quoting evidence of Torrens before Commons Committee of 1836. "Huskisson had more vision of the Empire than any other

(1828-30), considering "it desirable that an accurate examination should be made of the System at present in force for the granting of lands, and for the general disposal of the Crown Property in the different Provinces of North America," appointed John Richards as investigator for one year.[22] Not long afterwards with a change in the administration Viscount Howick, later third Earl Grey, became Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. He was quickly converted to the Colonial Reformers' views, and their first victory was won. On January 20, 1831, the principle of disposal of Crown lands by sale only was applied to the colony of New South Wales. A few months later this partial triumph was extended by the issuance of new land regulations for the colonies in general, checking the old abuse of free grants and ordering in future sale by auction at a minimum upset price for cash, and directing that the proceeds of land sales were to be appropriated to the conveyance of selected immigrants.[23] The first step in the new colonial era had been taken.

Meanwhile another great step had been taken. Late in December 1830, Charles Tennant made a motion for the appointment of a commission to examine into emigration.[24]

statesman of his own or the following generation, except Lord Durham." Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century,* p. 203.

[22]Treasury to R. W. Hay, 5 April 1830; *re* Murray's letter of 29 March. C.O. 384/26.

[23]In Canada at least these new regulations do not seem to have been enforced to any great extent (see Durham's Report). Charles Buller in his famous speech to the House of Commons on Systematic Colonization (April 6, 1843) acknowledged "how much we owe to others who had the opportunity, when in office, of giving executive effect to improved principles. Among these, the first place is due to . . . (Lord Howick), who, in February, 1832, when he had been about a year in office, took the first great step that the government has taken in the right direction, by promulgating the regulations whereby the sale of land was substituted for the old irregular habit of gratuitous grants, and the application of the proceeds to the conveyance of selected emigrants was commenced." *Op. cit.,* p. 41.

[24]For correspondence with Goderich (Col. Sec.) concerning motion see C.O. 384/28. Notice of motion 2 December, motion 20 and remarks 21 December. *Hansard* contains no record of the motion.

Two months later there was governmental action from the new convert of the Colonial Reformers. Lord Howick moved for leave to bring in a bill by which he proposed "to empower the Crown to appoint Commissioners for the purpose of superintending the business of emigration, and regulating its details, which were now either altogether neglected, or left almost wholly to the operation of chance."

It would be the business of these Commissioners to give to the emigrants advice and assistance, to provide them with the means of conveyance to the colonies, and to put them in the best way of getting employment, and maintaining themselves by their own industry when they got there. In proposing this, he did not mean that any expense should be thrown on the general income of the country—it was his intention, that individuals, or parishes, should bear the expense thus incurred. He proposed, therefore, that with the consent of two-thirds of the inhabitants of a parish, the overseers should be at liberty to enter into contracts with individuals who wished to emigrate.

Paupers who emigrated in this way, however, were to waive all claim to relief if they returned to the United Kingdom. The expense of this scheme Howick considered would be trifling. He concluded by observing that "the Government only claimed the merit of having adopted the ideas of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Wilmot Horton) who had so long and perseveringly urged on the country the consideration of the subject."[25] After some long debate the motion was agreed to, but, owing to the dissolution of parliament (22 April 1831), the proposed bill was not carried through its readings. Just as the new parliament assembled, the Colonial Secretary, Lord Goderich, took action and appointed a commission of five members. The warrant, issued 24 June 1831, named the Duke of Richmond, Viscount Howick, F. T. Baring, H. Ellis and R. W. Hay as Commissioners "for the purpose of collecting and diffusing information on the subject of Emigration to the British Possessions abroad, and also for the purpose of render-

[25]February 22, 1831. *Hansard,* Third Series, II. 875-906. Hereafter, unless specified, references are to the Third Series of *Hansard.*

ing any such assistance as it may be in your power to afford to Persons desirous so to emigrate."

Accompanying the warrant were instructions. Owing to the failure of Howick's measure to appoint a commission "it has been resolved to issue this temporary Commission in substitution for that which was contemplated in the Bill," but with somewhat more limited powers. The Treasury would not place funds at their disposal to assist emigrants, but it was nevertheless hoped that great advantages would result from their work. In the first place the Commissioners were to ascertain the labor situation, advantages and disadvantages of each colony, and prepare and distribute abstracts of this information. They were to do the same for methods of emigration (ports, contracts, expenses, etc.). Secondly they were empowered to make contracts with shipowners on behalf of the guardians of the poor in parishes if so requested. But they were to incur no expense themselves; agreements were to be made in writing; exact accounts were to be kept, and auditors were to be appointed. The government would instruct officers at the ports to act in obedience to instructions from the Commissioners. Finally, the Commissioners were instructed to report to the Colonial Secretary from time to time, but at no stated intervals. A secretary, occasional copying clerks, and stationery would be provided as needed; but all official correspondence with colonial governors, heads of departments, etc., was to be carried on through the Secretary of State for the Colonies. "A suitable apartment will be appropriated in this Office for conducting the business of your Commission."[26]

The appointment of the Commissioners was a second partial triumph for Wakefield, and the second of the "landmarks" of 1831. The period of experimentation in colonization fields had ended; the government now was beginning to develop an emigration policy on broader and more general lines. A new colonial era was beginning.

[26]Goderich to Commissioners, 1 July 1831. C.O. 384/27.

Thomas Frederick Elliot, a member of the Colonial Office staff, was at once appointed Secretary to the Commission and began his long connection with problems of emigration and land policy. The Commissioners promptly set to work. Their first act was to publish a notice setting forth their functions, but emphasizing that they had no funds of their own and would only manage the expenditure of funds raised by individuals or parishes if paid in advance. A second notice was issued at the same time giving information respecting the Australian colonies.[27] Three months later some funds were placed at their disposal when the government decided that the revenue from the newly-adopted method of selling Crown lands in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land should be appropriated to the encouragement of the emigration of females thither, and that £10,000 should be immediately applied to that purpose. Wakefield's ideas were gaining ground! The Commissioners drew up regulations for this assisted emigration: applicants were to be between eighteen and thirty years of age; each one approved would receive from the fund the sum of £8, *i. e.,* about one-half the expenses of emigration. The Commissioners made the arrangements for the vessels, equipment and other details.[28] "It was by means of this first Board of Emigration Commissioners, and the application of the small sum of £10,000 derived from the first land sales (or rather by the expenditure of that sum in anticipation of what these sales would produce), that a commencement was made, in the despatch of vessels to New South Wales fitted for giving passages at a moderate cost to emigrants of the rank of labourers."[29]

[27]Notices dated 8 and 18 July 1831. At the end of their first quarter the Commissioners presented their first report to the Colonial Secretary, 24 September. See C.O. 384/27; and P.P. ‡328 (1831).

[28]Commrs. to Goderich, 10 October 1831. C.O. 384/27.

[29]Grey, *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration,* I. 310-311. But note this passage from the parliamentary debates. Alderman Wood, on 14 March 1832, presented a petition from William Cobbett, arguing against

The Commission was not long-lived. A few more papers were published giving accounts of prices and wages in the colonies, and a report (the second) was presented on March 15, 1832.[30] Then, on August 4, after fourteen months' activities, Lord Goderich dismissed the Commissioners. He thanked them for their report and noted the satisfactory results of their work.

You have now fulfilled the principal objects pointed out in the instructions addressed to you at the time of your appointment; and it is a great pleasure to me to convey to you the satisfaction of His Majesty at the mode in which you have performed this duty. The reduction in the price of passage to New South Wales and Van Dieman's Land has rendered it no longer expedient that you should offer to provide the conveyance to them of all persons, possessing the requisite funds, who should apply to you for the purpose. In the case of the North American Colonies there are many reasons why the intervention of a Government Board, in providing the conveyance of emigrants, would neither be desirable nor, unless with the aid of a large and expensive establishment, practicable. I am not aware, therefore, of any further duties in the performance of which I can avail myself of your services. The correspondence to which your appointment has given rise differs rather in quantity than in kind from the usual correspondence of the Colonial Department. An increased disposition has been created to apply to Government for information; but as that information is now collected, and arranged in a form convenient for circulation, the distribution of it becomes a comparatively easy task. The management of the expenditure which you have instituted for the encouragement of emigration to the Australian Colonies may also, I think, be carried on in my office. I shall still leave the more immediate superintendence of the business hitherto transacted by you to the gentleman [Elliot] belonging to my department who has acted as your secretary, and who, by the experience he has acquired under your authority, will be enabled to preserve the same spirit that has heretofore governed the conduct of this business. Under these circumstances, I feel that the time is come at which I may relieve you from your duties; and,

the principle of emigration, and opposed to giving public money to encourage emigration. "Mr. Hume thought, the petitioner was under a mistake in supposing that there now existed a Commission which had received a grant of money for the encouragement of emigration. The Commission had no object of that kind in view; he believed it only furnished individuals who were desirous to emigrate with the best information." *Hansard,* XI. 205.

[30]Printed in P.P. #724 (15 August 1832).

with a full sense of the valuable aid I have derived from your labours, may take upon myself the direction of all future correspondence respecting emigration. I have, etc., Goderich.[31]

Despite its brief existence the Commission of 1831 marked a distinct step forward in the government attitude towards emigration. Elliot was now given particular charge of emigration correspondence and business in the Colonial Office, while "the business of selecting female emigrants and the management of emigrant ships [were entrusted] to a charitable committee, later called the London Emigration Committee, who voluntarily gave their services and acted under regulations sanctioned by the Government." The Committee continued until the end of 1836, when, at its desire, its resignation was accepted.[32]

Just a year after Lord Howick's emigration bill had failed through lack of time, the Earl of Carnarvon, in asking if Government had in view to propose any legislative measures to facilitate emigration, inquired particularly about a plan of some time since for parishes to mortgage their poor rates to raise funds for the assistance of emigration. Goderich replied that Government had no intention of introducing such a measure. There were many objections to the previous bill, and "he had, therefore, declined renewing" it.[33] Two years later, however, action was taken in this direction. The Poor Law Act of 1834 (4 & 5 Wm. IV, c.76) empowered owners and ratepayers to raise money on security of the rates for the purposes of emigration, the money to be recoverable if the person assisted refused to emigrate or returned to England.[34] Some years later the Irish Poor Law Act (1 & 2 Vict., c.56) provided that the Poor Law Commissioners there also might

[31]Goderich to Commrs., 4 August 1832. C.O. 384/27.

[32]Mills, *Colonization of Australia,* pp. 187-193. See *Hansard,* XXXV. 12-13.

[33]*Hansard,* IX. 1146-1147. Voluntary emigration, Goderich said, was very satisfactory as it was without government intervention. February 2, 1832.

[34]Section LXII.

assist emigration by raising sums of money to defray "the Expenses connected with the Emigration to British Colonies of poor Persons . . . "[35] The provisions of the Poor Law of 1834 led to the appointment of an agent-general, J. D. Pinnock, "to form the link between the Colonial Office and the local organization conducting emigration."[36] From year to year small parties of poor persons received parochial aid in reaching the colonies (generally the British North American); but the numbers were never very large. In the first place many were unwilling to set out "burdened with the cloak of pauperism"; and in the second place paupers were not the type of immigrants desired by the colonies.[37]

Meanwhile important steps had been taken in another direction. The annual exodus to the colonies, particularly to Canada, was attaining unheard-of proportions. In 1829 there had been 31,198 emigrants; in 1830 the figure jumped to 56,907, and then to 83,160 and 103,140 in the succeeding years. With this startling increase in the volume of emigration came terrible revelations as to the treatment endured by emigrants on board ship.[38] As the season for 1833 was about to open the Mayor of Liverpool, the leading port in the passenger trade, wrote to Colonial Secretary Stanley pointing out the expediency of stationing a naval officer there to superintend emigration. Stanley approved the suggestion and secured the sanction of

[35]Section LI (31 July 1838). Note that the law specifies emigration to British colonies; two years earlier (1836) the authorities in England had decided that local finances could not be used for furthering emigration to a foreign state. See Johnson, p. 50.

[36]Cowan, p. 178. Mills (pp. 190-191) gives another explanation. "The Home Government was urged to insist upon more care in the management of emigration. Governor Bourke [of N.S.W.] in 1834 had suggested the appointment of some responsible person to superintend the selection of emigrants. Accordingly, in 1835, Mr. J. D. Pinnock, who had been for some time attached to the emigration business of the Colonial Office, was appointed to the position of Emigration Agent."

[37]Johnson, p. 94. See the Poor Law Reports for numbers assisted.

[38]Egerton, p. 283.

the Treasury Lords.[39] Lieutenant Robert Low was immediately appointed, reached Liverpool on May 5, and two days later had his office open. His appointment was the first in the long series of able, efficient Emigration Officers.

Lieutenant Low was intended as an experiment; his work proved to be highly successful, and it was decided to establish a corps of officers. At the end of the year R. W. Hay, the Permanent Under-Secretary, wrote to the Treasury upon the matter, stating the advantages which had been derived from the appointment of Low and asking their sanction to the appointment of similar agents at the ports of Portsmouth, Plymouth, Bristol, Dublin, Belfast, Cork, Glasgow, and Leith, "provided the authorities at these Ports may shew a similar inclination to that which has been manifested at Liverpool to assist the objects for which such Agents would be appointed."[40] After some further correspondence negotiations were opened with the towns concerned.

Plymouth was the first to be approached. The Corporation Committee agreed that an agent was desirable, but considered that the state of finances prevented the promise of any pecuniary co-operation, and the limited accommodations of the Guildhall precluded the offer of office space there.[41] Ports-

[39]Letters of 27 April and 3 May 1833. C.O. 384/33. C.O. 384/32 largely consists of Low's very extensive correspondence. Huskisson in 1828 had pointed the way by appointing as Immigration Agent at Quebec A. C. Buchanan who "had long been in touch with the Colonial Department." His duties were to afford information regarding available land and employment to persons arriving from the United Kingdom. He was to be responsible directly to the Colonial Office, and received a salary of £400 annually, defrayed from the colonial land and timber fund. Cowan, p. 176. From 1832 on, Buchanan's annual report was regularly printed by parliament. In 1836 Buchanan sr. went to England on sick leave, his place being taken by A. C. Buchanan jr., who two years later became permanent agent. The two performed very valuable services.

[40]Hay to Treasury, 9 November 1833. Treasury replied, 27 January 1834, that they would not object but asked re salaries. An estimate, with Portsmouth omitted, was ordered prepared by Hay. C.O. 384/36.

[41]Hay's letter, 28 January 1834; Mayor's reply, 4 February; minuted: offer to be made to Mayor of Portsmouth. *Ibid.*

mouth was then approached as an alternative; but the Mayor had heard of no need for an agent.[42] Hull also declined; the Mayor after inquiry found the general opinion was that such an appointment was not required and "would add nothing either to the protection or convenience of Emigrants."[43] In the end, however, seven appointments were made in 1834, bringing the corps to eight officers. The first of these were John Henry at Bristol and Edward Miller at Belfast; a month later (April) Samuel H. Hemmans was sent to Greenock and Charles Friend to Cork; at the end of April and beginning of May Richard Lynch and T. E. Hodder reached their posts at Limerick and Dublin. Finally, in mid-July, James R. Forrest was appointed to Leith.[44] All the agents were instructed in the same language. They were to inspect vessels as to seaworthiness, water supply, provisions, and fulfillment of the Passengers Act. Secondly, they were to afford information to clergy, parish officers and gentry who wished to assist tenants to emigrate. Thirdly, they were to endeavor to prevent frauds on ignorant and unsuspecting persons. Finally, "all emigrants will be given every information that may be useful to them."[45]

The officers, all of whom were lieutenants of the Royal Navy on half pay, received a salary of £208. 5. 0—that is "£150 and the difference between the Half and Full Pay £58. 5. 0; the former to be payable, as usual, by the Admiralty."[46] For this purpose the sum of £1457. 15. 0 was appropriated for the salaries of the seven "Agents for Emigration

[42]Hay's letter, 7 February; Mayor's, 10 February; minuted: "Refused an Agent. Put by." *Ibid.*

[43]Hay's letter, 6 March; Town Clerk's, 13 March. *Ibid.*

[44]C.O. 384/35; C.O. 385/8, pp. 1-96. Appointments were:- Henry, 10 March; Miller, 10 March; Hemmans, (arrived 4 April); Friend, 2 April; Lynch, 22 April; Hodder, 28 April; and Forrest, 12 or 14 July.

[45]See letter of Hodder, 19 May 1834, published in local (Dublin) press. C.O. 384/35.

[46]*Commons Journals,* LXXXIX. 762.

at Ports in the United Kingdom."[47] On several occasions in the past there had been special grants in aid of emigration, but this vote in 1834 was the first one for an emigration establishment. Mr. Secretary Stanley, in presenting to the Committee of Supply this new item in the Miscellaneous Estimates, explained the situation.

In the course of last year, communications were made from the town of Liverpool setting forth the frauds which were practised on poor people who, being desirous of emigrating, were induced to come over from Ireland to that town, and take their passage in ships which were represented as being about to sail immediately, but which frequently did not leave the port till several months after; and, in the meantime, the means of these poor persons being exhausted, they were left either to starve or to be supported by the parish in which they might happen to be placed. In consequence of the extent to which this grievance had been carried, he [Stanley] last year tried the experiment of sending an agent to Liverpool, to watch over the interests of persons desirous of emigrating, and, from all parties, from the people of Liverpool, and from emigrants themselves, he had received the most gratifying testimonies of the benefit which had resulted from that proceeding. Since the appointment of this officer no less than 15,000 persons had come under his supervision. His duties were to receive applications from emigrants, to give them advice as to the course which they should pursue, to see that no frauds were practised on them; and, if the provisions of the law were not complied with by the merchants, to direct the emigrants to the quarters in which they could obtain redress. The officer at Liverpool had, by his exertions, succeeded in putting an end to a long train of abuses, and in putting the trade on a more respectable footing than it had ever stood upon before. . . . Encouraged by the success which had attended the experiment at Liverpool, he [Stanley] had sent notice to the sea-ports of the kingdom from which persons usually emigrated, that he would appoint agents if they would afford the same facilities which had been offered by Liverpool, and to all ports which acceded to that proposition agents had been sent.[48]

[47]Vote of 12 May 1834, for the fiscal year 31 March 1834-31 March 1835. The agents were those at Liverpool, Bristol, Dublin, Belfast, Cork, Limerick and Greenock. Forrest was not appointed to Leith until after the vote had been passed. *Ibid.*, p. 278.

[48]The government's policy, it was pointed out, was that of "assisting the progress of spontaneous emigration."—Lord Sandon testified to advantages

The expansion of the corps of officers continued. Early in 1835 Hay secured the consent of the Treasury to station an agent at Sligo and Lieut. Peter Shuttleworth was appointed to the post.[49] As had been suggested in parliament, Hay sought to station an agent (J. D. Pinnock) at London also, but the Treasury did "not feel justified in assenting." At the request of New South Wales, however, Pinnock was appointed at that colony's expense.[50] Two years' experience showed this arrangement to be insufficient, and Secretary Glenelg informed the Treasury that he believed a regular agent was required at London. That board thereupon agreed to the appointment of Lieut. James S. Lean at the usual salary.[51] As a result of these new appointments the annual emigration appropriation rose steadily: 1835-36, £1666 (for eight agents); 1836-37,

derived from the agent at Liverpool; Mr. Hume heartily approved, and recommended the appointment of one at London also. "The Vote agreed to." April 18, 1834. *Hansard,* XXII. 963-965.

[49]Hay to Treasury, 7 April; reply 14 April. C.O. 384/39. Shuttleworth appointed 16 April. C.O. 384/38.

[50]Hay to Treasury, 17 January 1835; replies 29 January and 10 February. C.O. 384/39. Pinnock also held an appointment as the connecting link between the Colonial Office and the Poor Law authorities (*vide supra,* p. 15). In February, 1836, he issued a printed notice, headed "Emigration Department, Colonial Office," stating that he had "been appointed the Government Agent General, (resident in London,) for the furtherance of Emigration from England to the British Colonies, by affording all facilities and information to Parish Authorities and Landed Proprietors desirous of furthering the Emigration of Labourers and others from their respective districts. This Officer is also empowered to contract with Ship Owners for the passage of such Emigrants, thus securing to Parishes who may avail themselves of that Clause in the Poor Law Bill, an economical and safe appropriation of funds raised for purposes of Emigration." C.O. 384/87. Note that the duties of Pinnock are similar to those of the Commissioners of 1831.

[51]Stephen to Treasury, 10 January 1837; Lean appointed about 17 February. C.O. 384/45. Lean had written to Glenelg, 12 September 1836, sending credentials and asking for appointment as Government Emigration Agent; Stephen replied that his application would be considered, but discouraged any expectation as there were many other applications. C.O. 384/41.

£1874. 5 (for nine); 1837-38, £2664. 16. 3.[52] While the government was building up this corps of emigration officers it had carried through parliament a new, revised Passengers Act for the better supervision of the now very extensive emigrant trade.[53]

At the same time important developments were taking place in another field. Parliament in 1836 appointed a Select Committee to consider the whole question of colonial lands. The report of the Committee, drafted by its able chairman, H. G. Ward, was "evidently framed under the influence of Wakefield's convincing evidence."[54] The Committee recommended, with regard to the Australian and West Indian colonies and the Cape, "that the whole of the arrangements connected with the sale of land, including both the price and the precise mode of sale, should be placed under the charge of a Central Land Board, resident in London, and made responsible either to some existing department in the Government, or to Parliament directly, as may be deemed expedient."[55] This Board, the report continued, acting through local boards in the colonies, should be charged both with the superintendence of the surveying department and with the duty of "so directing the stream of emigration as to proportion in each case the supply of labour to the demand." The net proceeds from sale of land were to constitute an emigration fund, each colony receiving immigrant labor in exact proportion to the amount of its own land sales. The Committee believed that it would be "perfectly practicable to raise, upon the security of the future land sales, the funds necessary to set on foot a plan of systematic emigra-

[52]Votes of 17 July 1835, 11 August 1836, 28 June 1837. *Commons Journals,* XC. 461; XCI. 780; XCII. 526.

[53]*Vide infra.*

[54]Egerton, p. 283; see also Lucas, *Durham's Report,* I. 178; and Garnett, pp. 243-244.

[55]Garnett says (pp. 243-244): "This was carried in Committee, but obstructed by the Government, whose representative, Sir George Grey, Colonial Under Secretary, . . . voted steadily against all the specially Wakefieldian clauses of the Report."

tion, upon a scale sufficiently large to meet the exigencies of the Colonies and of the mother country."[56] Truly was it Wakefield speaking through the Committee of 1836. The importance of the Committee and its report can hardly be over-estimated. Both Prof. Egerton and Sir Charles Lucas agree that "in accordance with these recommendations, Lord John Russell appointed [the] Land and Emigration Commission . . . "[57]

The Emigration Board, however, was still in the future; the immediate outcome of the Waste Lands Committee was another appointment. At the end of 1836 when the London Emigration Committee resigned its duties, Lord Glenelg took the opportunity of carrying out to some extent the recommendations of the parliamentary committee by appointing Thomas Frederick Elliot as Agent General for Emigration.[58] Elliot, it will be remembered, had served as secretary to the short-lived Commission of 1831, and after its dissolution had continued to supervise that work in the Colonial Office. Some time later he went out to Canada as secretary to the Canada Commissioners, returning to England in the spring of 1837. Stephen had written to the Treasury Lords in January of that year proposing the appointment of a chief agent for emigration, in which suggestion the Lords agreed. He then wrote to Elliot in Canada offering him the appointment (17 February), but the letter did not reach him until his return to England late in April. Elliot at once accepted the office on condition that he should not lose his permanent position in the Colonial Office. The salary had been fixed at a minimum of £800 rising to a maximum of £1000; Elliot asked that the regular annual increase be £50. Both these requests were agreed to.[59] The

[56]Egerton, pp. 283-284.

[57]*Ibid.;* Lucas, I. 178-179.

[58]Mills, *Colonization of Australia,* p. 193.

[59]Stephen to Treasury, 9 January and 22 April 1837; Treasury to Stephen, 31 January, 3 and 8 May. C.O. 384/43. Elliot to Grey, 21 April

Treasury also approved the grant of an office for the Agent General. It was some time, however, before suitable rooms could be obtained. At the end of the year quarters were at last secured, and it was agreed, after personal communication between Elliot and the Treasury, that the cost of furnishing them (£249) should be paid from imperial, and not colonial, funds. Some time in February 1838 the Agent General established himself in his office at 2 Middle Scotland Yard.[60]

With some branches of the government the Agent General was permitted to correspond directly (as, the Treasury, Customs, Poor Law Commissioners), but with the Admiralty and the governors of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land correspondence in both directions had to be relayed through the Colonial Office. Elliot soon pointed out the inconvenience of this procedure and secured Glenelg's consent to communicate directly with the latter as well, except in matters of importance.[61]

The Agent General's activities were particularly concerned with the two colonies mentioned above—New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. His first long report to Secretary Glenelg described in considerable detail the past history and present status of emigration to those colonies. The practice of sending shiploads of females to Australia had been discontinued, but some ships were being sent from Bristol, the Hebrides and Ireland, with selected, free passage, emigrants of both sexes. The report concluded with some suggestions concerning the future selection of emigrants.[62] The next few months were

1837. C.O. 384/42. The appointment was to date from the day of Elliot's return to England, either April 1 or 17. P.P. #388(1838).

[60]Treasury to Glenelg, 8 May; Glenelg to Treasury, 23 December 1837. C.O. 384/43. One of Elliot's letters, of 14 February 1838, is dated from the Colonial Office; another, of 17 February, and all subsequent correspondence, is from the new address. C.O. 384/46.

[61]Elliot to Stephen, 23 November 1837; letter to Admiralty, 2 December. C.O. 384/42.

[62]Elliot to Stephen, 10 July 1837. *Ibid.*

spent in formulating plans, and then, with the stimulus of a successful experiment in South Australia encouraging the government to try Wakefield's plan, a new emigration to the other two Australian colonies was set under way. In October 1837 and July 1838 Elliot circulated printed notices describing the assistance offered to certain types of emigrants proceeding to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. At the same time the Agent drew up instructions for agents who were appointed to select suitable emigrants from Ireland.[63] The Colonial Office was very pleased with this work of the new official and drew the attention of the Treasury Lords to the facts that

> in the year 1837 Mr. Elliot effected an emigration to New South Wales three times as numerous as the average of previous years, and that in the present year [1838] he has carried on an emigration at the rate of between seven and eight times the average before his appointment, and that the expenditure of which the responsibility mainly rested on him amounted to upwards of £40,000 in the former year and is estimated to exceed £100,000 this year, and further that the number of officers whom it is his duty to superintend and correspond with amount to thirteen resident at different stations in the country and to about twenty employed afloat in charge of different emigrant ships in their progress to New South Wales. . . .[64]

In 1839, however, Governor Gipps reported a decrease in the colonial land revenue, and the assisted emigration was threatened with immediate cessation. Then the imperial Treasury, acting upon Elliot's recommendation, agreed to sanction for that year a continuation of the New South Wales emigration upon the same scale as the preceding year.[65] For the time being the situation was saved, but the future was doubtful.

In his last report as Agent General (18 January 1840) Elliot presented a summary of the government emigration to

[63]Elliot to Stephen, 28 October 1837 and 31 July 1838. C.O. 384/42 and 47. Glenelg gave his approval to the various documents.

[64]C.O. to Treasury, 18 July 1838. C.O. 384/49.

[65]Elliot to Stephen, 22 April 1839; C.O. to Treasury, 30 April; Treasury reply, 21 May. C.O. 384/53. See also C.O. 384/54.

New South Wales during the three years preceding. In the first place he pointed out that the shipping, that is "the hire of vessels, the fitting-up of them, and the purchase and regulation of the supplies," was under his care from the beginning and "has been well spoken of by all." Secondly, the care and discipline of the people on board was at first (1837 and 1838) confided to the surgeons of the respective ships, in accordance with the plan proposed by the colony. Much sickness prevailed during those years and the system soon caused so much dissatisfaction that, at the end of 1838, Elliot "resolved to take the system on board under the immediate responsibility and control of this Office." This arose in connection with the government emigration ship *Asia*. After numerous complaints had been received about the vessel Elliot decided to go down to Plymouth and visit in person, carrying the Colonial Secretary's instructions to use his own discretion in settling the difficulties. After an examination of the ship and conditions on board Elliot drew up a list of regulations to be observed during the voyage. The *Asia* finally sailed, and after a passage of three and a half months arrived safely at Sydney on 10 May 1839; during the voyage not one death occurred on board! "This was the first Vessel in which was established the Code of Regulations for the discipline of the people, that has since been extended to all Government Emigration Ships."[66] The wisdom and value of the rules demonstrated in this first voyage were repeatedly proven in subsequent sailings. Between October 1838 and January 1840, out of twelve government ships sent from Britain there had been deaths in five only, and in four of these the number lost was no more than two. Before that time deaths usually numbered over ten per ship! The code of

[66]For the details of this case see Elliot's correspondence, 30 October-13 November 1838, in C.O. 384/48. Also C.O. 386/44, pp. 147-148. A copy of "regulations to be observed on board Government Emigration Ships," signed by Elliot and dated 2 Middle Scotland Yard, 30 March 1839, is in P.P. #536.I (1839), pp. 20-21.

regulations was subsequently expanded to a printed volume of instructions to surgeons superintendent.

Thirdly, with respect to the selection of emigrants, Elliot remarked that the colonies wanted the very best, while his agents had to take the best they could get. Young married couples without children were the most suitable emigrants, but they were just the ones who would not go. In 1837 and 1838 the proportion of children under seven years of age in government ships had been 34 per cent. and 23 per cent.; in 1839, however, Elliot had been able to reduce it to 11½ per cent. This was an important factor in the reduction of the death rate on the voyages. Finally, with regard to the fitting-out of vessels, the Agent General expressed his belief that the use of ships entirely fitted out and supplied by government had been of service in the past, but for the future he advocated recourse to private competition.

> . . . However strenuously may have been urged every defect which could be found or supposed in the Government Emigration, it must always remain a satisfaction to the officers employed at home during the last three years, and will, I doubt not, weigh duly with the reflecting part of the community in New South Wales, that those officers found the Emigrants assisted to proceed to Sydney going by Hundreds, and that they have sent them by Thousands; that they found the Colony still inadequately known, and by no means popular, that they now see it very well known (as the extent itself of the new Emigration sufficiently proves), and in many parts of the Country preferred to all places of Resort.[67]

The Agent General's duties were not confined solely to the two Australian colonies New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land. All the colonies, except South Australia, came within his sphere, as well as miscellaneous matters pertaining to emigration. As one of his first tasks Elliot had been directed to consider and report upon the distress in the Western Isles

[67]Elliot to Russell, 18 January 1840; letter endorsed: "7 Feb. This should be communicated to the Govrs and to Parliament. JS." C.O. 384/58; printed in P.P. #113 (1840).

and Highlands of Scotland. The distress, he believed, was largely due to the break-up of the kelp trade; emigration might serve as a remedy, but there were great difficulties in the way of any extensive government-conducted scheme.[68] Another matter concerned the Cape of Good Hope. The colonial government had been corresponding with the Agricultural Society in England upon the possibility of securing farm-apprentices from the home land. At Glenelg's request Elliot perused this correspondence, but found himself unable to recommend adoption of the measures proposed therein.[69] For Western Australia, however, an assisted emigration was set under way, and Elliot drew up for circulation "Regulations concerning Bounty on Emigrants introduced by purchasers of land" in the colony. Under these rules a purchaser of land in that Australian possession was entitled to a remission of £18 in respect of every British emigrant he might import, who should fulfil as to health and age the qualifications specified.[70]

The corps of emigration officers established in 1833 also came under the supervision of the Agent General. After studying the distribution of the officers Elliot concluded that only one new agent was needed. England was well supplied with officers at Liverpool, Bristol and London; no agents were necessary in the south nor at Yarmouth nor Hull, nor were any required in Scotland other than those already stationed at Leith and Greenock. In Ireland, however, an emigration officer was badly needed at Londonderry.[71] In accordance with Elliot's strong recommendation Glenelg appointed Lieut.

[68]Elliot to Stephen, 29 July 1837. C.O. 386/19, pp. 365-378.

[69]Elliot to Stephen, 13 March 1838. C.O. 386/21, pp. 231-237.

[70]Regulations dated 12 October 1839. C.O. 386/26, p. 75½; see also C.O. 384/53 and 55. Arthur Mills (*Systematic Colonization*, pp. 21-22) erroneously called these regulations "the first steps taken by Government for the exportation into the colonies of the surplus labour of this country . . . "

[71]Elliot to Stephen, 17 October 1837, in answer to letter of 11 July. C.O. 384/42. In addition to those mentioned there were officers stationed at Dublin, Cork, Belfast, Sligo and Limerick.

Ramsay to the new Irish post.[72] At the same time the pressure of business at the port of Liverpool led to the appointment of an assistant to Lieut. Low.[73] In addition to these new appointments there was one change in the personnel of the corps; Lieut. Peter Starke, in August, 1839, succeeded Lieut. Miller who had resigned his post at Belfast.[74] In January, 1840, when the office of Agent General was abolished, the distribution of the corps of officers was as follows: in England, Low and James (Liverpool), Henry (Bristol), and Lean (London); in Scotland, Forrest (Leith) and Hemmans (Greenock); in Ireland, Hodder (Dublin), Friend (Cork), Starke (Belfast), Lynch (Limerick), Ramsay (Londonderry), and Shuttleworth (Sligo).

During the three years 1837-1839 the establishment of the emigration office had grown from one to five. In April, 1838, Elliot secured Lord Glenelg's permission to appoint John Walpole, a clerk in the Colonial Office, as assistant in the Agent's office.[75] In addition three clerks were employed to handle the office work and correspondence.[76] Eighteen months after its establishment the emigration office was placed upon a more permanent basis. One of the conditions of Elliot's appoint-

[72]Ramsay, appointed 1 January 1838, was the eleventh agent; the Customs at Londonderry afforded him office accommodation. C.O. 384/42 and 43.

[73]January 1838; a Mr. Jones, who first held this position, was relieved on 8 May 1839 by Master Robert James, R.N. C.O. 384/52; C.O. 386/21, p. 77; 23, p. 65.

[74]Appointed by Normanby, 12 August, at usual salary. C.O. 384/52; C.O. 386/23, pp. 357-358. The emigration appropriation rose from £2664.16. 3 for the fiscal year 1837-8 to £3871.16. 3 for 1838-9, and decreased to £3540 for 1839-40. The last two votes included Elliot and part of his staff as well as the emigration officers. *Commons Journals,* XCIII. 766; XCIV. 517.

[75]Elliot to Glenelg, 2 April 1838. C.O. 386/21, p. 377. The appointment was sanctioned by the Treasury, to date from 1 April. C.O. 384/46.

[76]Two were paid from New South Wales funds; the third, Engelbach, received £100 from the sum voted by parliament. This salary being insufficient, Elliot in 1839 proposed £150 with an annual increase of £10 to a maximum of £200; he took the occasion to pay a tribute to Engelbach's services. Approved, 17 October. C.O. 384/52.

ment, as he had stipulated, was that he should not lose his permanent post in the Colonial Office nor his right to return to it. After more than a year and a half as Agent General, however, he realized that he could not return to the Colonial Office without doing great injury to the other persons there. Therefore, not wishing to retain an indirect advantage at the expense of injustice to others, Elliot resigned all further claim upon his former situation in the colonial department.[77] The days of experimentation had ended; this new bureau was intended to be a permanent one. Thus, at the end of 1839 there was in existence a regularly established Emigration Office with an Agent General, an assistant and three clerks, plus a corps of eleven Emigration Officers and an assistant stationed at the outports of the United Kingdom. The Agent's time was primarily taken up with New South Wales, but there was only one colony which did not fall within his sphere of interest; with that one exception all matters pertaining to emigration were referred by the Colonial Office to the Agent General for advice and action.

In addition to this department there was another emigration office of longer standing, but with narrower duties. This office also had been established, though less directly, through government action. It was the Colonization Commission for South Australia. As soon as the Colonization Society had been formed in 1830 Wakefield and his friends made plans to put their theories of colonization to the test of actual experiment. South Australia was decided upon for the site of the trial, and government was approached for support and a charter. But government was timid about committing itself to any such scheme; long delays followed, protracted negotiations were carried on. Finally in 1833 a South Australian Association was formed with Robert Gouger and Colonel Robert Torrens[78]

[77]Elliot to Glenelg, 17 December 1838; accepted 21 Dec. C.O. 384/48.

[78]Robert Torrens (1780-1864) was born in Ireland; appointed first lieutenant in Royal Marines 1797, captain 1806; served with distinction on

as its most energetic members; Wakefield, who was their inspiration, did most of his work behind the scenes. Another name should not be forgotten, that of George Fife Angas who may be called the financier of the movement. After some three years of negotiating the government finally consented to the introduction of a South Australian Colonization Bill, but not as a government measure and on the understanding that the government should be put to no expense in the enterprise. Wolrycke Whitmore, a member of the Association, sponsored the measure (July 1834), explaining that its object was to introduce a better principle of colonization and to encourage the emigration of able-bodied laborers. Mr. Baring, who led the attack, denounced the bill as a "speculation" containing the views "of a set of . . . experimental philosophers." The bill, however, passed the Commons without much opposition and was carried through the upper House with the support of the Duke of Wellington.[79] On August 15, 1834, the South

Walcheren expedition in 1811; severely wounded and promoted to brevet rank of major; served in Peninsular campaigns and was appointed colonel of a Spanish legion; promoted lieutenant-colonel 1819, colonel 1837; retired on half-pay 1835. In 1815 Torrens published "An Essay on the External Corn Trade" the arguments of which Ricardo considered "unanswered and unanswerable." He was one of the first economists to attribute the production of wealth to the joint action of three "instruments of production"—land, labor and capital—and to state the law of diminishing returns. In 1818 he was parliamentary candidate (liberal) for Rochester; failed of election; in 1826 was returned for Ipswich, but was unseated; in 1831 returned for Ashburton; supported Reform Bill; retired from House 1835. In same year published a volume advocating colonization of South Australia; member of S. A. Land Company 1831; and of reorganized S. A. Association. In May 1835 appointed chairman of South Australian Commissioners; Emigration Commissioner 1840-1. One of the proprietors of "Traveller" newspaper and editor of "Globe." An original member of Political Economy Club; elected fellow of Royal Society 1818. Died in London, 27 May 1864. His economic writings exercised no little influence on Peel's legislation. His son, Sir Robert Torrens, was first premier of South Australia. *Dictionary of National Biography*, XIX. 993-995.

[79]Debates of July 23, 29, 31 and August 2 and 5 in Commons; August 8, 11, and 14 in Lords. *Hansard*, XXV. 429-432, 700-712, 793-795, 909-911, 960, 1047-1048, 1132, 1254. Harrop, pp. 71-72.

Australia Act received the Royal Assent (4 & 5 Wm. IV, c. 95). His Majesty was empowered to establish one or more provinces, and to appoint three or more "Colonization Commissioners for South Australia" to carry certain parts of the Act into execution. The Commissioners were to make regulations for the sale of the colonial lands, upon the condition that land must be sold by auction or otherwise at a uniform price of not less than twelve shillings per acre. The whole proceeds from land sales were to be used as an Emigration Fund for the assistance of poor persons from Great Britain and Ireland, such poor persons to be as far as possible adults not over thirty, with the sexes in equal proportions. The Commissioners might borrow £50,000 upon the credit of land sales for the use of emigration, and £200,000 upon the credit of the ordinary revenue for the use of the expenses of the colony; they were to report on their proceedings at least once a year. The Act finally provided that there was to be no transportation of convicts to South Australia and that the colony was to receive a constitution when it had 50,000 inhabitants.[80]

There were still further delays before the experiment actually got under way. The list of South Australian Commissioners was finally approved by the Colonial Secretary on 27 April, 1835, and they were gazetted a week later, with Colonel Robert Torrens as chairman.[81] Next year, with the support of Angas as chairman, a joint stock South Australian Company was formed, colonists were collected, ships dispatched, and at last, on December 28, 1836, the colony of South Australia was officially proclaimed. The Commissioners for the next four

[80]Act 1&2 Vict., c.60 was passed 31 July 1838 to amend the earlier act. It permitted the use of the Emigration Fund for other expenses on condition that the sums were repaid, and the use of the proceeds of land sales in payment of revenue securities.

[81]The others were Mackinnon, Hutt, Lefevre, Palmer, Montefiore, Mills, Barnard, Roberts and Pennington. An early list of six names (February) had included Angas; it was expected that Stephen would be added. C.O. 386/11, pp. 78-81.

years acted as an intermediary board between the colony and the Colonial Office; they had their own establishment and office in Adelphi Terrace, London. The South Australian experiment, wrote Merivale, "succeeded, in respect to the quantity of land sold and the number of emigrants conveyed, beyond the expectations of the boldest speculators. The government at home shook off its prejudices, and resolved on applying it, though prudently and even timidly, in New South Wales."[82] This early success, however, soon ended and by the spring of 1840 the colony had fallen upon evil days.

After eight years and more of preaching the Colonial Reformers, it would seem, had achieved a fair measure of success. An actual experiment was under way in South Australia upon avowedly Wakefieldian principles; they had secured a government committee in 1836 to inquire into their system of colonization, and as a result an Agent General for Emigration had been appointed.[83] But these half measures were not sufficient; the government should go the whole way. In 1838 a commission went to Canada to inquire into the insurrections there; Durham, the new Governor-General and head of the mission, Charles Buller, his chief secretary, and Gibbon Wakefield, his unofficial adviser, were all of a like mind. The so-called "Durham Report" of 1839, the result of their investigations, is a classic statement of the principles of the Colonial Reformers. Buller, in his Appendix B on Public Lands and Emigration,[84] advocated the new land policy—that land be sold at a fixed, uniform and sufficient price; that licenses to cut timber also be sold and not granted; that wild (waste) lands be taxed; that the funds thus secured be devoted to the

[82]Merivale, p. 429. For a full account of the experiment see Mills, *Colonization of Australia, passim.*

[83]Further, the Transportation Committee of 1837 had recommended as a cure for the colonial scarcity of labor an immigration fund obtained by raising the price of land in accordance with Wakefield's principles. See Garnett, pp. 240-243.

[84]Dated 2 November 1838.

construction of internal improvements and the encouragement of a regular flow of immigration; and that to start this work at once a loan be raised on the future revenues of the colony.

In order that the plan thus suggested may be carried out with uniformity and effect, it will be necessary that some special authority should be created, charged with the execution of the whole measure, and rendered thoroughly responsible to Parliament. It is obvious, indeed, that no sufficient machinery for this purpose exists at present, either in the Colonies or in the United Kingdom. . . . I should suggest, therefore, that a central commission should be appointed in the United Kingdom, with subordinate general and assistant commissioners in the Colonies. To these should be entrusted the whole execution of the plan; and the central commission in England should have power to frame such rules, orders, and regulations, having the force of law, as would be necessary to give effect to the principles [of the plan, which must be] laid down in [an] Act of Parliament. The duty of the English Commission would be to regulate the disposal of the public lands and timber, to regulate the imposition and application of the proposed tax, to provide for the selection and transport of emigrants, and to raise by way of loan the monies required for all these purposes. The Colonial Commission would see that the regulations of the English Board were carried into effect; would superintend the execution of all public works; would receive and forward emigrants; would provide employment for such as were not employed by the inhabitants of the colonies, and would exercise a supervision and guardianship over them for a specified period. . . .

As a guarantee for the responsibility of the proposed commissions frequent reports of all their correspondence and proceedings should be laid before both the imperial and colonial legislatures. "Without provisions for entire publicity in the proceedings of these commissioners, I should despair of any very beneficial results from their appointment. The evils which I have had to describe could not have so long existed without any adequate attempt to remedy them, if the administration under which they have taken place had not been conducted in secrecy."

Without such a special authority, it would be idle to expect that any measure, however admirable in principle or perfect in detail, can be satisfactory in practice. The experience of all the Colonies,

up to the present moment, has sufficiently shown, that no care in framing general regulations can be effectual without some more constant and peculiar control than it has hitherto been practicable to exercise. . . . That the Secretary of State for the Colonies should still have the supreme control [of the issue of rules for the disposal of public lands], as of other matters of administration connected with the colonies, appears undoubtedly advisable; and this will be secured by a provision, that all regulations framed by the Board of Commissioners should receive his sanction; but the enforcement of these regulations, if it is intended that they should be enforced, ought to be entrusted to some special and peculiar authority, and subjected in every possible way to the public inspection. I suppose that the costs of the proposed commission would be defrayed by the revenue which this system of colonization would call into existence.[85]

The matter did not rest with the presentation and publication of the Report. Mr. Ward, one of the reform group, brought it up in the House of Commons and Buller's views were again laid before the government. In a long and able address Ward discussed the colonial land problem along truly Wakefieldian lines. A survey of social conditions in the British Isles led him to the key-note of his speech: the waste lands of the colonies "are a trust, which the Government of this country is bound to administer for the public good; and, further, so to administer, as to afford the means of reaching the Colonies, if they desire it, to all those whose poverty, not their will, binds them to our shores." Wakefield in his *England and America* had described the correct land policy. A responsible Land

[85] *Durham's Report* (Lucas ed.), III. 128-130. The Reformers were curiously inconsistent on some points. The general view of colonial lands, a view shared by Wakefield and his followers, was that they were "an heritage held in trust for the common purposes of the Empire," and all English statesmen started with the firm intention to retain the control of those lands in the hands of the mother country. Buller in his articles on "Responsible Government" declared that a colony could not be allowed to interfere "with the immigration of British subjects and the disposal of its unoccupied lands, or the trade with Britain." (*Op. cit.* (Wrong ed.), p. 105.) In Durham's Report these points were specifically reserved for the imperial government. Yet the Reformers were advocates of responsible self-government for the colonies! It was not many years before the self-governing colonies assumed control of immigration, lands and trade.

Board must be created; an act must be passed by parliament applying the South Australian principles to all the colonies. In conclusion Ward proposed four resolutions:—(1) That colonization improves the condition of all in the United Kingdom. (2) That land should be sold at a sufficient price, and the money used to provide free passages to the colonies. (3) "That in order to derive the greatest possible advantage from this method of colonizing it is essential that the permanence of the system should be secured by the Legislature, and that its administration should be intrusted to a distinct subordinate branch of the Colonial Department, authorized to sell colonial lands in this country; to anticipate the sales of land by raising loans for emigration, on the security of future land sales, and generally to superintend the arrangements by which the comfort and well-being of the emigrants are to be secured." (4) That this method has worked in South Australia and should be generally applied. Sir Wm. Molesworth seconded the motion in another able address in which he reviewed the history of New South Wales and the transportation problem and considered the cost of Ward's project. Mr. Labouchere, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary, agreed that there had been a "total want of all system" in previous land policy; yet he did not favor the new scheme. "If they took from the colonies all control, and gave it to an office in London, he did feel that the results might be very disastrous and unfortunate." Viscount Howick also spoke at length in criticism of the resolutions.[86] Ward rose again to conclude the debate. He defended his resolutions, but as it was now too late to legislate in this session he would leave the matter in the hands of government and hope that it would be dealt with during the recess; accordingly he begged leave to withdraw his resolutions.[87]

[86]He agreed with the principle of the motion but objected to a "fixed, uniform and sufficient price," and hoped Ward would not press to a division.

[87]June 25, 1839. *Hansard,* XLVIII. 841-919. The speeches of Ward, Molesworth and Labouchere are given from corrected reports. Buller also spoke.

Two weeks later the subject was again before the House. Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Wilmot Horton presented a petition "detailing certain statements respecting Emigration and Colonization, and praying for the appointment of a Select Committee at the commencement of the next Session of Parliament, to take into consideration the said subjects." The paper was read and ordered to lie upon the Table.[88] It was now quite evident that government must take some action with regard to the twin problems of colonial lands and emigration, or else face continual attacks from the reform group. The recess lay ahead during which the solutions to the problems could be worked out by the ministry. The situation confronting them in the summer of 1839 may be summarized as follows:

(1) There was generally recognized to be a crying need for some measure of government regulation and supervision of emigrants from the time they left their old homes until they arrived and were settled in their new ones. There was truth in Buller's charge that emigration was "irregular and ill-regulated," and that "the state exercised not the slightest control over the hordes whom it simply allowed to leave want in one part of the empire for hardship in another."[89] Emigrant vessels were overcrowded, ill-ventilated and unsanitary; provisions too often ran short; there was no medical assistance available, and moral conditions were even less cared for. In order to remedy the situation the government had enacted several Passenger Laws, and in 1833 had commenced building up a corps of Emigration Officers at certain ports to assist the progress of spontaneous emigration.

(2) Since 1830 there had been a persistent agitation in the press and in parliament for the adoption of a plan of systematic colonization under the control of a board which should sell the colonial lands and out of the funds received conduct emigration. The Colonial Reformers' system was being tried in

[88]July 11, 1839. *Commons Journals,* XCIV. 429.
[89]Buller, *Speech,* p. 48.

South Australia and so far had proved successful. Parliament had shown its interest in the kindred subjects of colonial lands and emigration by appointing several committees, two of which (1826-7 and 1836) had strongly recommended the establishment of an emigration board. One Colonial Secretary, Huskisson, had suggested a land board for the colonies; another, Goderich, had appointed an Emigration Commission. In 1837 an Agent General for Emigration had been appointed; under his supervision Wakefield's scheme was being applied to some extent in New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land and Western Australia. The materials for a land and emigration board were ready to hand—Agent General, Emigration Officers, and South Australian Commissioners; all that was necessary to meet the continued demands of the Colonial Reformers was to consolidate these agencies and enlarge their powers. Would the government do it?

II
THE COLONIAL LAND AND EMIGRATION COMMISSION

PARLIAMENT ended its session on August 27, 1839. A few days later Lord John Russell replaced Lord Normanby as Colonial Secretary in Melbourne's cabinet; at the same time the Hon. R. Vernon Smith (later Lord Lyveden) succeeded Labouchere as Parliamentary Under-Secretary.[1] James Stephen, who had been appointed Permanent Under-Secretary in 1836, had the duty of "breaking in" his new superiors. At the first occasion he explained, in a long minute to Russell, the relation of the South Australian Commissioners to the Colonial Office, concluding with the comment: "The only question that remains, is that which relates to the general success or failure of this scheme of Colonization. It does not occur to me that there is any sufficient motive for entering into the discussion of this topic, which however appears to be the only point remaining for your Lordship's consideration." Russell replied that the colony would be tested by time, and that there was no reason for his giving any prophetic opinion upon it, which might be belied by events.[2]

Two months later Stephen again brought up the subject of the Colonization Commissioners.

Mr. Vernon Smith. There are three Dispatches today from South Australia. They are of little interest or importance. I refer to them for the following reason.

Ever since the foundation of this Colony, three years ago, it has been a source of constant perplexity to determine what are the respective rights and powers of the Government on the one hand, and of the South Australian Commrs on the other. So strangely worded is the Act of Parliament, that every attempt to draw this line has but aggravated the difficulty. It was thought

[1]Normanby was in office on 31 August; on 3 September Russell sent out a circular letter notifying the colonial governors of his appointment. See G. 43, p. 35.

[2]Minute by Stephen, 12 September 1839. C.O. 13/15.

by Lord Glenelg that the only practicable course was that of the most unreserved confidence towards the Commissioners to whom he accordingly sent every Dispatch which reached him inviting their suggestions on every question touched in any such Dispatch. Thus we have gone on in perfect concord with them, though perhaps occasionally at the expense of yielding on some questions on which there may have been very serious doubts whether they should not rather have been opposed.

If the former practice is to be continued the three Dispatches received today will be sent to the Commissioners for their perusal and suggestions. But not being quite sure whether Ld John Russell will approve this, I have directed that nothing shall be done until we have his instructions. . . .

Vernon Smith forwarded the papers to his superior with the comment that it was undesirable to alter any arrangement which had hitherto succeeded, but that the "first good opportunity should be seized of defining the separate powers of this office and the Commissioners." Russell was non-committal; the course of sending all the dispatches to the Commissioners should be continued, but "I do not know that we ought to follow their advice unless it is good advice, or unless it appears we have no power of controverting them."[3]

The "first good opportunity" came three weeks later. The Commissioners put themselves in Stephen's hands when they wrote to him requesting that Lord Russell grant them an interview "in order that they may make a communication to his Lordship on the subject of their receiving remuneration for their services . . . "[4] Stephen now had a definite project in mind and immediately wrote to Smith unfolding the scheme "for the improvement of the system at present established with regard to Emigration, and the settlement of Crown Lands in the Colonies." There were already in existence two establishments—Elliot, the Agent General, had one office and

[3]Minute by Stephen, 15 November 1839. *Ibid.*

[4]Torrens (chairman of Commission) to Stephen, 9 December 1839. C.O. 386/15, pp. 155-156. A copy of the correspondence respecting a salary for the chairman was enclosed; it shows that after several months' consideration a salary of £600 for that officer was approved on 23 August 1837.

clerks and also supervised the Emigration Officers at the outports; the South Australian Commissioners had a separate office, "the precise counterpart" of the first. Although only one of the Commissioners, the chairman, Torrens, received a salary, the establishment was nevertheless "a very expensive one." Now the eight unpaid Commissioners were applying for salaries at the same time that Elliot was asking for an increase of his. Stephen's proposal was to consolidate the two establishments, "to substitute three Commissioners or Agents General for Emigration for the ten persons at present designated by those Titles, and to enlarge considerably the sphere of action of the Body when thus consolidated. This measure would I think be attended by a considerable saving of money, and a great increase of efficiency, and it would go far to satisfy the demands of Mr. Ward and his associates on this subject."[5]

First, with regard to economy. Elliot's establishment cost in all £3540,[6] and the South Australian one £3221.11. 8; a total of £6761.11. 8 annually. "Now it needs no argument to show that if the two Offices were consolidated much money might be saved in house rent, hire of clerks, agency and so on. Besides such a consolidation would be the most effectual answer to the demand of the eight unpaid S A Commrs."

Secondly, as to efficiency. No one will doubt that three men will do much more work and will do it better than ten men, when the work to be done is all effected at one and the same place and by the co-operation of different minds. A Board of nine Commrs sitting in London to send Emigrants to So Aus is as ill-imagined an Institution as could well be mentioned. . . . Coll. Torrens tells me that the result has been to produce a lamentable waste of time, and to convert the Board into a sort of debating Club, discussing for days together the most frivolous and unmeaning subjects. Moreover, there is at present an unseemly and injurious competition between the two offices in the persons of their subordinate Agents. They act, write, and talk as rivals; and carrying

[5]*Vide supra* for Ward's demands.

[6]This was divided: board £1000, office rent and contingencies £150, eleven agents and an assistant £2390.15. See C.O. 384/62. Stephen pointed out that the cost was an annually increasing one.

into the same parts of the country views hardly reconcilable with each other produce misconceptions injurious to each Establishment.[7]

Thirdly, as to the enlargement of functions. We greatly require an Office which should superintend the whole business of the Sale of Crown Lands in the Colonies, and especially in Australia—a kind of Colonial Board of Woods and Forests. Such a Board would act as Referees on all such questions. They would be the Depostaries [sic] of all information on the subject; and would afford such information to all applicants, or to the public at large. They would consider of the propriety of selling lands at New Zealand, Port Essington, and other Districts in Australia yet to be opened. To them might be delegated the initiation, and the dispatch in the first instance of all business connected with Emigration, especially to the Australian Colonies. Each of these Colonies would then receive the same advantage and equal protection, and this office would be relieved from a class of duties for the right discharge of which it is certainly unqualified.

The only objection which Stephen foresaw was that of the eight unpaid Commissioners. But they had no right to complain, for they would merely be relieved of a *gratuitous service.* "He must be a bold Minister who should in these days create eight new salaried Commissioners for the management of the affairs of South Australia." By the end of 1840 there would be at least 20,000 in the colony, and "the remonstrances of such a body against paying for nine salaried Commissioners should not be lightly provoked." If Russell deemed the scheme feasible, there was no impediment legal or financial to its immediate execution.

Vernon Smith fully approved the plan; it was what he would himself have proposed. If his superior also approved, he and Stephen would prepare the details. Russell entirely agreed in the propriety of the plan, "except that I think two Commissioners, with a Secretary, will be better than three Com. but I am not sure of this." The Commissioners should have charge of the Crown lands in all the colonies, and should

[7]This refers to the agents hired on commission to secure emigrants for South Australia, New South Wales and Western Australia.

report to the Secretary of State; but they should not be authorized to act independently except in matters of detail.[8]

Stephen supported his plan in several other minutes,[9] but further argument was scarcely necessary. The new arrangements were quickly completed. One step was to consult the heads of the two establishments concerned. Stephen proposed to Elliot and Torrens the problem of preparing "the schedule of an Establishment equal to carrying on, under a Commission of three Members, the joint duties of the two existing offices, together with the more extensive functions now in contemplation; and to state how far it seems probable that this will be effected without any immediate increase of expense upon the whole." They submitted a detailed report, pointing out that if "two establishments, not already excessive, be joined together without any diminution of the business they are to conduct, but on the contrary an important addition to it, . . . within themselves [no] saving can be expected, which should give room for the creation of a Board and Secretary without additional expense." If any saving was to be made it must be in payments for the "out-of-door services." These were of three classes, commissions on sales of land, remuneration for the hire, survey and equipment of shipping, and finally charges for the selection and care of emigrants until they embark. (1) With a consolidation of the offices they believed that the commission on land sales, formerly 5 per cent. in South Australia, could be reduced to 2½ per cent. (2) In the shipping work they calculated a considerable saving could be made. (3) The exact amount of saving in the emigration work they could not estimate in advance, but "that it will be a source of saving, however, can scarcely be doubted."

[8]Minutes by Stephen (10 Dec.), Smith (11 Dec.) and Russell (13 Dec.) on Torrens' (Commrs.') letter of 9 December 1839. C.O. 13/15. Torrens, Elliot and Rowland Hill were apparently being considered as the three Commissioners; Smith doubted if they would pull well together.

[9]See his minutes on letters of 16 and 19 December. C.O. 384/55.

The South Australian establishment, including the chairman, cost £3150; the Emigration Office, including its head but excluding the emigration officers, would very soon cost £2000 annually. The two present establishments then cost £5150; the expense of the new establishment, excluding the three Commissioners, would amount to £3430, a saving of £1720. To this should be added £2050 the estimated savings upon land sales commissions and shipping survey. In other words Torrens and Elliot calculated that the sum of £3770 would be available for the Commissioners' salaries, "or for any other purpose which the Government may think proper," without an increase of the total expenditure. They preferred to leave these salaries blank, "to be filled up by others."[10]

On the very day following the report of Elliot and Torrens, the Colonial Secretary dismissed the South Australian Commissioners.

[In acknowledging your letter of December 9] I avail myself of this opportunity for addressing to you a communication which it would be improper any longer to postpone. Her Majesty's Government having taken into consideration the highly important subject of the alienation of the unsettled Lands of the Crown throughout the British Colonies, with a view to promote as far as may be possible a well regulated system of Emigration, have resolved to constitute a Body to superintend that service, subject to the general superintendence of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State having the Department of the Colonies, and the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. With this view it is designed to establish a Colonial Land and Emigration Board consisting of three Members. In their persons will be united the duties at present performed by yourselves, and by the Agent General for Emigration; and with this view the Queen will be advised to revoke the Commission under which you are now acting; and

[10]Memorandum, in Elliot's hand, also signed by Torrens, dated 22 December 1839. C.O. 384/52. The proposed schedule called for a secretary (£600), seven officers (£600, 350, 220, 200, 150, 100, and 80), four clerks (£70 each), a treasurer (£300), an accountant (£200), two messengers and a housekeeper (£150), and contingencies (£800). The secretary's salary was apparently not added in to the total of £3430. The cost of the proposed establishment is a perplexing question; none of the several estimates agrees with the others.

to renew it in favour of the three Members of the Board to which I refer.

It is therefore unnecessary that I should trouble you to attend at this Office on the subject of your Letter of the 9th Instant; or that I should express any opinion as to the expediency of maintaining a Body of nine Salaried Commissioners for the Management of Emigration to the single Colony of South Australia. But I cannot close our official connection without requesting you[11] to accept my grateful acknowledgment of the ability[11] with which your duties as Members of the South Australian Commission have been discharged.[11] [12]

The next step was to officially commission the members of the new board and prepare their instructions.[13] Two commissions were necessary, the one constituting T. F. Elliot, R. Torrens, and E. E. Villiers[14] as Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners, the other appointing them as Colonization Commissioners for South Australia. After Stephen had discussed with the members of the new board the order of their

[11]At the three points indicated words have been struck out of the draft of the letter: "collectively," "and zeal for the public service," "nor without congratulating you on the success with which they have been attended." Vernon Smith wrote in the margin: "I think there is rather too much compliment here. It always occurs [? . . . ?] in these eulogies upon abolished officers. If they were so very useful why not continue them?" "I agree in this. JR."

[12]Russell to Commrs., 23 December 1839. C.O. 13/15.

[13]The formal sanction of the Treasury was given on 10 January 1840. C.O. 384/62.

[14]Rowland Hill had at first been suggested as a commissioner, but his name was soon dropped (*vide supra*). Edward Ernest Villiers, the third Commissioner, was the fifth child (fourth son) of G. W. Villiers, third son of the first Earl of Clarendon. Edward Ernest was born 23 March 1806; married 1 August 1835; offered governorship of the Cape (1837) but apparently declined; appointed Emigration Commissioner January 1840; died 30 October 1843, leaving wife, son and three daughters. His oldest brother, George William (1800-70), became fourth Earl of Clarendon and on 10 October 1839 was appointed Lord Privy Seal in Melbourne's cabinet. The third brother, Charles Pelham (1802-98), was noted for his advocacy of the repeal of the Corn Laws. A younger brother, Henry Montague (1813-61), became bishop of Carlisle and Durham. See Maxwell, *Life and Letters of George William Frederick, Fourth Earl of Clarendon,* I. 7, 137, 176. *D. N. B.* gives sketches of four of the brothers but has no reference to E. E.

names in the commissions, Russell decided that Torrens' name should come first in the Australian commission, and Elliot's first in the other,[15] the distinction to be observed in correspondence with them. Both commissions were quickly drafted and received the Queen's signature on 10 January, 1840. The instructions naturally took somewhat longer to frame. The original intention to have two sets was changed to have instructions for the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners only. Stephen sent the draft[16] to Lord Russell on January 3, and then to Smith, away in the country, on the following day. The latter made one or two comments. A second draft was then drawn up, some additions and corrections made, the date 14 January 1840 inserted, and the instructions were then written out in final form and signed.[17]

The new Commission began its official existence on 14 January 1840 when Lord John Russell sent to its members the three documents. The first of these, the commission from the Queen dated 10 January, revoked the existing commission of the South Australian Commissioners and replaced it by a new one. William IV, so the document ran, acting under the power of an act of parliament, had appointed ten men as Colonization Commissioners of South Australia; the commission had been renewed upon the accession of Queen Victoria, 14 October 1837. The Queen did now "revoke, annul and make void" their warrant, and appointed Robert Torrens, Thomas Frederick Elliot, and Edward Ernest Villiers "to be, during Our

[15]When Stephen sent the draft commissions (9 January) for the approval of Smith and Russell "so that the Commissions may go forward," the former wrote in the margin opposite the names: "I would not comply with such nonsense. Why should not Col. T. be always first on account of his age.—R. V. S." Russell cut short any discussion of the point: "This is settled. JR." C.O. 384/62.

[16]The names in the original draft, in Stephen's hand, read Torrens, Elliot, Villiers. This was at once altered "to place the names in alphabetical order, the authority being equal."

[17]There is only one page extant of the draft of 3 January; the second draft, however, is complete. C.O. 384/62.

pleasure, Commissioners for carrying into effect . . . the said Act . . . as the same is amended by an Act made and passed in the second year of Our reign . . . "[18]

Accompanying this was the second commission of the same date, addressed to "Our trusty and well-beloved Thomas Frederick Elliot and Robert Torrens, Esquires, and Edward Ernest Villiers, Esquire (commonly called the Honourable Edward Ernest Villiers)." It set forth that

there are within divers of Our colonies, plantations and possessions abroad large tracts of waste land vested in us in virtue of Our Royal prerogative, and subject to alienation at Our pleasure: And whereas by various Commissions . . . to the respective Governors of Our said several colonies . . . , We have authorized . . . the said . . . Governors . . . to sell and dispose of such lands, subject nevertheless to all such rules and regulations as are comprised in Our instructions. . . . And whereas We have judged it expedient that provision should be made for carrying into effect the powers so granted . . . by the establishment within this Our United Kingdom of a Board of Commissioners. . . .

Elliot, Torrens and Villiers were accordingly appointed during the Queen's pleasure to be "The Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners," and were authorized "to execute this Our Commission in such manner and under and subject to all such instructions as shall from time to time be addressed to you for your guidance therein by one of Our Principal Secretaries of State, or by Our Commissioners of Our Treasury for the time being . . . " In particular they were empowered to contract for the sale of waste lands in the colonies, and "to apply the monies arising from any such sales towards defraying the expense of the removal of emigrants from this Our United Kingdom to any colony . . . wherein the lands so sold may be situate."[19] Three provisos were attached to the

[18]This separate S. A. Commission remained in force until 1842 when it was revoked (5&6 Vict., c.61) and South Australia became an ordinary colony.

[19]The Commissioners were also authorized to assist the colonial governors in applying to emigration any monies raised by the governors through the sale of lands.

commission. It was not to alter or affect any appropriation "now made, or hereafter to be made," by law or by the authority of the Commissioners of the Treasury, of any sums raised by the sale of waste lands; nor was it to interfere in any manner with the due execution of any law made by a colonial legislature concerning the sale of waste lands in that colony or the appropriation of the proceeds of such sales. Finally, nothing contained in the commission was to interfere with the execution of the statutes concerning South Australia, or with the execution of the separate South Australian commission.

Covering the two commissions were Russell's long instructions of 14 January, 1840. The result of his inquiries into the present system of managing the Crown lands in the colonies, and into the plans hitherto pursued in aid of emigration, had been to convince him of the necessity of some new arrangement at once more comprehensive and more efficient. The first step in that direction was to consolidate the two existing establishments.

Three Commissioners, devoting their time exclusively to this employment, will necessarily form a far more effective body than the more numerous board of nine, who have hitherto acted as South Australian Commissioners, but eight of whom, having served gratuitously, have been able to devote but a small part of their leisure to this employment. In the office of the Agent-general for emigration, on the other hand, the difficulties have unavoidably arisen from a single person being charged with extensive functions, incapable of even a temporary delegation, and executed without the benefit of the counsel and support of any colleague; but the disunion of the two offices has led to other and more evident evils. They have unavoidably been competitors with each other, to the disadvantage of the public revenue, for the hire of shipping of a peculiar class, and not readily obtained. The fact, also, of the existence of distinct offices, both under the authority of the government, may have given, unintentionally, some colour to the rival representations of irresponsible agents interested in the resort to separate colonies, and thence have contributed, though indirectly, to the evil of exaggerated appeals to the public, upon the merits of different settlements.[20]

[20]In the second draft a paragraph was struck out. "If not the chief it is one amongst the considerable motives of this change, that it will promote

For the present at least, Russell did not feel that it was necessary to enter into any explanation of their duties as Colonization Commissioners for South Australia. The acts of parliament and the instructions addressed to their predecessors would form the rule for the guidance of the new Commissioners. In their other capacity as a general board for the sale of lands and for the promotion of emigration, their duties fell under four heads: "first, the collection and diffusion of accurate statistical knowledge; secondly, the sale in this country of waste lands in the colonies; thirdly, the application of the proceeds of such sales towards the removal of emigrants; and, fourthly, the rendering of periodical accounts, both pecuniary and statistical, of your administration of this trust."

Lord Russell then proceeded to discuss in detail each of the four duties.

First. There is no subject on which misapprehension and fallacies are more easily propagated, or with more fatal success, than in reference to the state, resources and advantages of those numerous dependencies of this kingdom which are spread over every region of the American, African and Australian continents and islands. Nor is there any subject on which the public at large can with equal reason demand that the Government should, as far as may be possible, supply the ignorant and unwary with authentic and unexaggerated intelligence. When the Crown, in the person of its officers, undertakes to dispose of lands at so vast a distance, and to remove emigrants thither, it is not competent to them to decline the duty of imparting a faithful account of all the material circumstances by which the choice of emigrants, especially of the poorer class, should be determined. The Executive Government cannot . . . refer those with whom it has to treat to the ordinary sources of popular intelligence, knowing that those sources are often perverted, and unworthy of confidence, and that they are to be correctly appreciated only by laborious study. We have no right to interpose actively to promote emigration, and at the same time to leave the ignorant and helpless to explore, as chance may determine, questions so deeply affecting their future welfare. On the other hand, in undertaking to impart information

an immediate reduction, and a still greater prospective saving of expense, in a case where there [are] peculiar reasons for a frugal administration of the public resources."

for the guidance of men on such an occasion, we subject ourselves to a formidable responsibility. No diligence or sagacity can effectually guard against misconceptions, more or less material, as to the real state and prospects of colonies so numerous and so remote; and they to whom any erroneous statement may be made on such a subject by officers acting under the authority of the Crown, will ascribe to those errors any disappointment, from whatever cause arising, and will prefer claims for compensation, which it might be at once difficult to resist, and impossible to admit.

For this reason the Commissioners must take as the "first principle" of their official conduct "to be prompt in affording to all applicants the most easy access to all authentic means of knowledge, and resolute in abstaining from giving on behalf of the Government any pledge or warranty as to the accuracy of the information which you may so impart." Every capitalist or emigrant applying for information must be distinctly warned that the exactness of the intelligence given could not be warranted, nor could the Commissioners be held responsible for more than for "the communication of the truth according to your own apprehension of it." The same precautions were to be strictly enforced on all subordinate agents. "Yet, with your utmost caution in this respect, you will recollect that information given to the poor and ignorant by a Government officer respecting distant countries, will unavoidably be received in most cases with implicit confidence; you must therefore weigh and compare the statements you receive, and sift them scrupulously before you stamp them with any sort of authority."[21]

Subject to these qualifications it would be the duty of the Commissioners

to diffuse, either by oral or written statements, a distinct and compendious account of whatever relates to the agriculture, the commerce, the natural products, the physical structure, and the ecclesiastical and political institutions of each of the colonies in which you may offer lands for sale, care being of course taken to present such facts in the most precise and determinate form, unaccompanied by any superfluous comment, and still more to

[21]This last sentence was inserted in the second draft by Russell.

strip them of any language calculated to work on the imagination, or to interfere with the calm and dispassionate exercise of their own judgment on the part of those whom you may address.

To assist them in this work of diffusing accurate statistical knowledge, Russell had directed that all official returns, printed books, maps and charts bearing upon the subject, and at present belonging to the Colonial Office, should be deposited in the custody of the Commissioners. The various colonial governors would be instructed to use all the means in their power to supply any omissions in these materials. The Emigration Office would "thus gradually become the depositary of all this branch of statistical information, for the assistance, not of private adventurers only, but of this and of every other department of the state."

The second topic to be noticed was that of the sale of unsettled Crown lands in the colonies. Since 1831, Russell wrote, the principle had been acknowledged that the sovereign holds such lands in trust for the public good and cannot, without a breach of trust, make a gratuitous grant to any person. They "must be appropriated to public uses and for the public benefit." The first public uses are such as respect the future improvement of the colony through public works—as roads, quays, sites for churches and schools, etc. The next use of the waste lands is to create a revenue by the sale of them. Part of that revenue will be appropriated to the ordinary exigencies of the public service[22] and "the funds raised by the sale of lands in the colonies will be applicable to the conveyance of emigrants thither, so far, but only so far as that use of the fund may be compatible with a due regard for the pressing and necessary

[22]"Even in the case of South Australia, where the opposite principle was first maintained, the Colonization Commissioners found it necessary, after a short trial of the experiment, to apply to Parliament for an Act, which has authorized the application, even there, of the land revenue, in the first instance, to the support of the civil government; although, indeed, on condition that the sums so applied should be replaced to the emigration account, when the ordinary revenue of the colony may be adequate to meet that charge." The act referred to is 1&2 Vict., c.60.

demands of the local governments, for which no other resource can be found."[23]

The instructions then pointed out the colonies which would fall within the range of the Commissioners' operations.[24] Many of the possessions of the Crown, such as Malta, Gibraltar, St. Helena, Heligoland and the older West Indian islands, had no vacant or ungranted lands whatever; Prince Edward Island and Jamaica were almost entirely taken up. As for British North America, in Upper Canada and New Brunswick the sale of waste lands was vested in local authorities "with whom the Crown has no right of interference"; a similar offer had been made to Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, while in Lower Canada the question "must be regarded as in abeyance." In general, then, the Commissioners would have no power to contract for the sale of lands in British North America or in the adjacent islands. "With respect to these colonies, therefore, your duties will be limited. Still the information you will possess, and the agency which you will direct, will make it the interest both of those intrusted with the sale of land in British North America, and of emigrants about to proceed there, to

[23]This was contrary to the theory of Wakefield who insisted that all the proceeds from land sales should be devoted to the encouragement of emigration. It was probably with this in mind that Lord Russell added the following sentence to the draft of the instructions. "While fully admitting and insisting on the principle that the Crown lands in the colonies are held in trust, not merely for the existing colonists, but for the people of the British Empire collectively, it is perfectly consistent with that opinion to maintain that in applying the proceeds of the sales to the essential purposes of local good government, which must otherwise be unprovided for, the real interest of the Empire at large, not less than that of the colony itself, will be best consulted. I shall, however, be happy to find the colonies providing for such purposes of local government by import duties and other means, thus leaving the produce of the sale of lands free for the promotion of emigration from the United Kingdom."

[24]The powers of the colonial governor to sell land were in no way affected; the Commissioners merely had the right to exercise powers concurrent with his in that respect.

resort to you for co-operation, assistance and advice. On this topic, however, I will not now enlarge."[25]

In Trinidad and Guiana the unoccupied territory was both extensive and valuable; Bermuda's waste land, however, was chiefly cedar forest, valuable mainly for ship-building. On the other hand, the colonies on the west coast of Africa possessed but little unoccupied land and were wholly unsuitable for emigration from the British Isles. The Cape of Good Hope in the south had a great extent of territory but most of it was sterile and unfit for settlement.[26] "Thus it appears that the Australian colonies must be the principal field for your operations." Even here, however, it would probably be found that in Van Diemen's Land most of the available land had already been granted. On the other hand, New Holland and probably New Zealand contained certain districts which it was not possible to exhaust by any rational scheme of colonization for a long period of years. One great difficulty in Australia, however, was the complexity of land systems in operation; in South Australia land was sold at a uniform price per acre, while in New South Wales and Western Australia it was sold by auction at an upset price of twelve shillings per acre. In a perfectly new field of colonization, Russell wrote, he would prefer the South Australian method and would recommend it for new settlements; but to establish it in place of the auction method in the colonies already founded would be a change of great apparent difficulty, and would naturally be regarded with strong aversion by the existing proprietors. There were arguments for and against both methods of sale. "If the price were uniform, it is obvious that many valuable tracts might be sold far below their value, and the land revenue

[25]The last three sentences (those quoted) were inserted by Russell in the second draft of the instructions.

[26]"British Guiana, Trinidad, St. Lucia, Grenada, Dominica, the Bahama and the Bermuda Islands, Mauritius, Ceylon and the Cape of Good Hope, all possess Crown lands of more or less extent, and might all yield some occasions for you to promote the general objects of your Commission."

thereby greatly injured; on the other hand, it is urged with reason, that sales by auction expose the emigrant to vexatious uncertainty, and even to frauds, of which one signal instance has been proved in a court of justice."[27] Some change in the present system Russell believed to be necessary, but the whole subject was one which demanded careful investigation; that inquiry he delegated to the Commissioners.

Meanwhile one or two general rules were laid down. Auctions must take place within the respective colonies, and those alone. Contracts made by the Commissioners would not be for the sale of any specific lands or amount of land but only for a certain sum of money, which might be given to the colonial treasurer in part payment for lands bought in the colony at auction. This arrangement would have the advantage of enabling capitalists to defray the expense of removing emigrants to the colonies.[28]

The third general subject considered in the instructions was the application of the proceeds of land sales towards the removal of emigrants. Valuable information upon this point had been afforded by the experiments of Elliot while Agent-General for Emigration. 1. In the first place, in the work of selecting suitable emigrants two methods had been tried—travelling officers and resident agents. Each plan had been found to possess both merits and defects. Between these two modes of proceeding the Commissioners were "to judge according to circumstances, using the one or the other, or blending the two, as you may find most compatible with effectiveness and economy."

2. The class of persons best suited for emigrants, "other circumstances being equal, . . . would be young married couples without children." Generally speaking, however, unencumbered people would not leave their country, but the encumbered would; further, young couples without children were the

[27]This sentence had been inserted in the draft by Russell.

[28]For further details on this point, *vide infra.*

most apt to desert at the last moment before embarkation, and even in the colony they found it the easiest to wander. "For the present, however, it may be taken for granted that the Commissioners should aim at sending out young people with few children, having always a due regard to other qualifications."

3. What security could "best be taken against the inconvenience arising from the default of persons who had pledged themselves to embark" as emigrants? In Ireland it had been the custom to take a deposit of £1 from each single adult or head of family, refundable on arrival in the colony. In Scotland the extreme poverty of the Highland emigrants had prevented the use of this expedient, nor had it been resorted to in England.[29] "You will consider whether any better rules can be given under this head than those which have been practically followed."

4. Hiring ships for the voyage was a "topic of much practical importance." The shipping might either be engaged and all the supplies purchased by the public (the practice hitherto used by the Agent-General), or contracts might be made with shipowners to take out the passengers at a rate per head.[30] The Commissioners were to choose between the two methods, or send out some vessels upon trial on either plan.

5. Medical care of the emigrants on the voyage was another matter requiring the most careful attention. Elliot, while Agent-General, had tried to introduce some private surgeons into the emigrant-ship service to supplement the naval surgeons, but Russell recommended that the Commissioners retain as

[29]As the Poor Law Unions usually paid in part for the emigrant's outfit, the deposit of £1 would only be a further charge on them and not on the emigrant.

[30]The latter method was followed by the South Australian Commissioners and by the London Emigration Committee acting under the authority of the Colonial Office. The Transport Department of the Admiralty sent out convicts under the former plan; troops were sent out to India by the Company under the latter.

many of the latter as possible in their employ. A code of instructions had been prepared by the Agent-General for the management of the people on board the government emigrant ships, and the rules had also been adopted by the South Australian Commissioners and by some of the largest private shipowners. All reports so far received had been very favorable, so that Russell hoped the Commissioners would find the code "to provide for all material points."

6. "The proceedings to be adopted on the arrival of the emigrants at their place of destination" were, of course, a local matter.[31] But emigrants in the public ships should be apprized, before they sailed, that they would be sure of the option of maintenance, either in barracks or on board their vessel, for not less than one week after their arrival. All information as to the disposal of the emigrants, addresses of their employers, and rates of wages paid them, should continue to be obtained through regular returns to the Emigration Office.

7. Re the plan, previously mentioned, of allowing emigrants and capitalists to deposit sums of money with the Commissioners in exchanage for certificates to be used in discharge of an equal sum of money to be bid at future auctions of land in the colony. Such depositors would have the advantage of employing their money in the removal of emigrants of their own selection, subject to the approbation of the choice by the Commissioners. Thus any man or body of men wishing to remove a number of unemployed but eligible laborers to the colonies could do so by advancing the amount of the passage money which would be repaid by an equivalent amount of land.

8. The "bounty system" of New South Wales had been much discussed—"that is, the system of paying from the land revenue bounties to persons, proportionate to the number of eligible emigrants whom they may introduce into the colony

[31]New South Wales, for example, allowed emigrants in government vessels a month's board and lodging in public barracks.

from this country, the candidates for such bounties being intrusted with the selection of the emigrants, and with whatever relates to the management of the voyage." Whether this should be continued, and if so under what regulations, and what division of the land revenue should be made between bounty and public emigration were questions on which the Commissioners should report. "They are questions of so much importance, that your attention cannot be too soon, or too carefully, given to the right solution of them."[32]

9. Finally a word about those colonies which received only voluntary emigration, "subject to no other influence by any department of the Government, than from the diffusion of any information which it may appear expedient to publish, and the enforcement of any general rules which an Act of Parliament may supply for the regulation of passengers' ships." The Commissioners' service for these colonies would be to exercise a general superintendence over the naval agents resident at the principal ports, and see to the enforcement of the Passengers Act. This law often proved much less effective than could be desired; the difficulty was to draw the line between, on the one hand, unduly encroaching on the liberty of individual action in persons wishing to emigrate, and also exacting so much as to raise the cost of passage to a prohibitory price, or, on the other hand, failing to afford that protection which it was proper that British subjects embarking in large numbers for the colonies should receive from the public. An extensive body of notes for the amendment of the present statute had been collected in the office of the Agent-General and would, of course, receive the Commissioners' consideration.[33]

[32]This paragraph and the preceding one (7) were inserted by Stephen in reply to a minute written on the draft by Russell: "I think something should be inserted here as to the manner in which the payment of money in this country will facilitate the sending out emigrants."

[33]There had originally been a paragraph in this section concerning the establishment of depots for the collection of emigrants before embarkation; this had been struck out of the draft: " . . . if necessary, it may be proposed by them."

The fourth duty of the new officials was "the rendering periodical accounts, both pecuniary and statistical, of your administration of this trust." The Treasury Lords would instruct them concerning their financial reports and powers. On other subjects, whenever necessary, they were to report the facts of the case to the Colonial Secretary in order that he might convey to them the necessary instructions. Twice a year they were to report upon their proceedings—progress, results (favorable or otherwise), prospects, and suggestions for the advancement of their objects, or for improving the efficiency of their institution. They were, of course, to seek additional information as often as they found it requisite, and Russell would at all times be happy to afford them "the utmost possible assistance in the execution of the arduous and important duty, with which Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to intrust you." "Should you succeed in aiding the colonization of distant countries by judicious regulation and vigilant superintendence, you will perform a task inferior to none in the extent of its scope, and the magnitude of its results."[34]

A few days elapsed before the new Commissioners commenced their duties. Elliot meanwhile had prepared his last report in his separate capacity as Agent-General for Emigration.[35] A few weeks later Torrens, as chairman, prepared the 1839 report of the South Australian Commissioners. That body had already held its last meetings on Friday, January 3, 1840, when Russell's letter announcing the revocation of its commission was read before the board, and on the following Wednesday when the reply was read and adopted. Just as Stephen and Smith had foretold, the eight former Commissioners did not relish their dismissal. They and their friends protested strenuously that they had been so suddenly dismissed by

[34]The last sentence was added to the draft by Russell. The draft of the instructions is in C.O. 384/62; the original commissions are in C.O. 386/2. All three are printed in P.P. ♯35 (1840)—C.L.&E. commission, pp. 1-2; instructions, 2-9; S. A. commission, 9-10.

[35]*Vide supra.*

the colonial minister in order to make room for three of his political supporters as paid Commissioners. Several objected in particular to the assertion that they had been dismissed because they had applied for salaries; such application, they declared, had not been sent with their knowledge or concurrence.[36] But protests and complaints were of no avail.

The appointment of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission was another triumph for the Reformers of 1830. "Without detracting from the merit of Stephen's proposal, it is clear that to Wakefield is due the chief merit for this measure, which even more definitely than the appointment of Elliot, made emigration a department of government."[37] Stephen suggested it and Russell carried it through, but certainly the propaganda of Wakefield and his friends inspired it.[38] The Colonial Reformers had triumphed once again—yes; but once again, as on the previous occasions, the triumph was not complete. Their theory was recognized, but it was not put wholly into practice. Lands were not necessarily to be sold at a fixed, uniform and sufficient price; Russell expressed his preference for that plan, it is true, but he instructed the Commissioners to enquire into the subject and report. *All* the proceeds from the sale of lands were not to be applied to the conveyance of emigrants; nor were all colonial lands placed under the Board for sale. In short, a great plan of systematic colonization, such as Wakefield had in mind, was not to be established. The Commission was in fact a compromise. The government recognized in general the basis of the program which the Colonial Reformers were so actively advancing, but refused to go to the extremes they advocated. Neither absolute *laisser faire*

[36]See Hodder, *The Founding of South Australia,* p. 239. See also *infra,* Chapter XII.

[37]Mills, *Colonization of Australia,* p. 305.

[38]It is rather singular that one of Wakefield's biographers, Harrop, does not even refer to the Commission, and the second, Garnett, merely says: "Land Commissioners, however, were ultimately appointed by Lord John Russell, but only as an appendage to the Colonial Office" (p. 244).

nor systematic colonization was acceptable, but a mean between the two could be, and was, adopted. *Colonial* revenues might be appropriated to the assistance or promotion of emigration, but as far as the *imperial* government was concerned not a penny would be spent on *direct* promotion of colonization. Its policy was to be one of "judicious regulation and vigilant superintendence" of those persons who voluntarily left the United Kingdom to find another home over the seas.[39]

[39]Time after time in the years that followed the various Colonial Secretaries expressed this policy; see Chapter XII.

III

ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL

ON January 10, 1840, Elliot, Torrens and Villiers were commissioned as the Colonial Land and Emigration Board. A circular was dispatched from Downing Street to the colonial governors informing them of the appointment—"for the Management of the Sales of Land in the British Colonies, and for promoting a well regulated Emigration to them"—and directing them to give "all practicable publicity" to the Commissioners' instructions. The Commissioners would not correspond with them except through the Colonial Secretary, but the governors were to render every assistance in their power, "whether by supplying information or otherwise towards the more effectual accomplishment of the important object with a view to which this Appointment has been made."[1]

The new board met for the first time on 20 January, 1840,[2] and considered as its first item of business the question of office space.[3] Neither the house then in use by the Agent-General (2 Middle Scotland Yard) nor the one occupied by the South Australian Commission (6 Adelphi Terrace) was large enough for them both; no other house belonging to the Crown was available. After some negotiations a private house was secured in Park Street (No. 9) near the Irish Office and looking upon St. James' Park. The Commissioners signed a contract with the owner, Charles Pearson, leasing the building for twenty-one years at £300 per annum, terminable at the end of three, seven, or fourteen years on six months' notice. Another month passed before the house was fitted out and ready for its new

[1]Circular, 17 January 1840; signed by Russell. G. 46, p. 24.

[2]The members met as the South Australian Commission three days earlier (17 January). See C.O. 386/15, p. 206.

[3]C.O. 386/140, p. 2. This volume is the minute-book and covers, very briefly, the period 20 January 1840 to 17 March 1841; then it lapses to 1846.

occupants.[4] Meanwhile the Commissioners had two offices; as the Colonial Land and Emigration Board they were domiciled in 2 Middle Scotland Yard, while 6 Adelphi Terrace was their meeting place as South Australian Commissioners. Finally on Saturday, May 2, their new home was ready and on the following Monday the furniture was moved from Middle Scotland Yard. From May 6 on the letters of the Board bear the new address, 9 Park Street, Westminster.[5]

A second problem confronting the new officials was the office establishment to be maintained. As a beginning the staff of the old Emigration Office was taken over—the assistant secretary, John Walpole,[6] three clerks, A. H. Engelbach, J. T. Miller and J. S. Lewes, a messenger, Mr. Gray, and a housekeeper, Mrs. Jones.[7] At first no secretary was appointed, but in an early schedule of officials Stephen Walcott was tentatively listed for that position. There had been some disagreement between the Commissioners over the choice, but Walcott's selection met with the approval of the Colonial Office. Vernon Smith, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary, remarked that "the Commissioners seem to have decided the question of a Secretary for themselves, and to have made a happy selection"; to which Russell added: "I am of opinion on further reflexion that a Secretary should be named for the Colonial Commrs and

[4]See correspondence of 20 January to 15 April. C.O. 384/62; C.O. 386/24; C. O. 386/140. The lease was signed April 3. During the negotiations the Commissioners kept emphasizing that they were "much in want of a sufficient office for their present establishment."

[5]C.O. 386/24, p. 306. C.O. 384/59. There are one or two letters which bear the old address after May 6; these are probably slips of the pen. After June 1 a printed letterhead was used.

[6]Walpole entered the Colonial Office as probationary clerk (fifth class) on 9 March 1830; promoted to fourth class 26 January 1837; assistant to the Agent-General for Emigration 1 April 1838, salary £350; first clerk in Colonial Land and Emigration Commission, January 1840; salary increased to £400, 1 April 1847. C.O. 384/82.

[7]Return to address of Commons of 24 February 1840. C.O. 384/62.

that Mr. Walcott is the best person for that purpose."[8] Walcott was, indeed, already experienced in colonial affairs; he had been secretary to Lord Gosford in Canada, and in 1836 had written for him a report on the mode of issuing land titles there.[9] For thirty-eight years Walcott was very prominent in the work of the Emigration Commission, and it was but fitting that he who had labored so earnestly in the cause should be the last to bear the title of Commissioner. The official confirmation of his appointment as secretary was given on March 7, and, in accordance with the suggestion then made, the Board, by virtue of their powers as Commissioners for South Australia, named him secretary to that Commission also.[10] Walcott took up his new duties about April 1, performing in addition to his secretarial work the functions of cashier and accountant to the Board.[11] This original establishment of the Emigration Commission cost £4000, divided as follows: Elliot, Torrens and Villiers £800 each;[12] Walcott £600; Walpole £350; Engelbach £160; Miller £100; Lewes £100; messenger, housekeeper and contingent expenses £290.[13]

[8]Commrs.' letter of 25 February and minutes of 26 and 27 February. C.O. 384/58. When the formation of the Board was under consideration the proposal to have two commissioners and a secretary had been disapproved (*vide supra*); it is probably to this that Russell refers. The minute book records under 29 February: "Had interview at C.O. with Russell on . . . secretary for the Commission." C.O. 386/140, p. 13.

[9]G. 49, p. 191. Walcott was civil secretary to the government in Canada from 1 September 1835 to 1 March 1838, at £500 per annum. As secretary to the Commissioners he received £600 from 18 March 1840 (although his appointment seems to have been dated ten days earlier); on 1 April 1847 his salary was increased to £650. C.O. 384/82. On 21 July 1860 he became Commissioner and retired 31 March 1878.

[10]C.O. 386/44, pp. 278-282.

[11]C.O. 386/24, p. 259. C.O. 384/62. The Treasury drew up regulations for him to observe as financial officer, with details as to keeping of books, rendering quarterly accounts, vouchers, items, etc.

[12]In addition each Commissioner received £200 from South Australian funds, making a total salary of £1000.

[13]Commrs.' report of 8 August 1840. C.O. 384/62. In addition to this there was the expense of the corps of emigration officers. The agent at

During the first quarter at least, the members of the Board met frequently for the consideration of business. The first meeting, as already stated, was held on Monday, January 20; there were six other meetings that month, thirteen in February, twelve in March and twelve in April. After that month the minute book seems to be incomplete: there are three meetings recorded for September and again for October, one in January, 1841, and two in March; then there is a blank until 1846.[14] In the conduct of business between the Colonial and Emigration Offices it was the practice of the former, for the first thirty years, to refer to the Commissioners all dispatches, letters, etc., pertinent to them, the documents sometimes being sent in original but more often in copy. The Commissioners would then prepare their formal report and send it, as a rule, to the Permanent Under-Secretary. The Colonial Office wrote its comments upon the last page of this report, the lower right hand corner of which was folded up for the purpose.[15] The first of these minutes would be the finely-written notes of JS (Stephen), then those of the Parliamentary Under-Secretary and finally of the Colonial Secretary. Sometimes the Permanent Under-Secretary alone minuted the reports. Stephen usually gave his approval, frequently with some comments for his chief's information. Vernon Smith, when Under-Secretary, was often in disagreement. Hope and Stanley, who succeeded Smith and Russell as Under-Secretary and Secretary, usually

London received £308. 5, and his assistant £60; a grant of £150 was made for office rent; at Liverpool the agent received £308. 5, and his assistant £100; the agents at Leith, Greenock, Dublin, Cork, Belfast, Limerick, Londonderry, and Sligo received £208. 5 each. Parliament also voted £1500 annually for "agency in Canada." See Commrs. to Smith, 7 December 1840. C.O. 384/62.

[14]C.O. 386/140. At first the members present signed the minutes; this practice ceased after 19 March 1840. The entries are very brief; routine matters (correspondence) and an occasional interview are recorded. Walpole seems to have kept the minutes; did Walcott after his appointment drop the practice?

[15]This was the practice for all C.O. correspondence.

echoed the remarks of Stephen; time after time one finds: "I presume your Lordship will concur in this report. JS.—Yes. S." Towards the end of the Commission's existence,[16] the system of minuting was changed. The Colonial Office sent the original document with a separate, specially printed minute page to the Commissioners, who wrote their minutes and then returned the document for the C. O. comments. Occasionally the latter preceded the Commissioners' notes. These notes were sometimes simply a summary of the dispatch, sometimes a summary with comments, sometimes merely the word "seen"; but the comments, if any, were almost invariably acted upon by the Colonial Office. A vast amount of official correspondence from colonial governors or government departments was thus reviewed by the Commissioners.

The Emigration Commission was scarcely three months old when a rift appeared in its ranks. A report upon a colonization project at Port Essington had been drawn up and signed by Elliot and Villiers; Torrens, however, dissented and, having views with which his brother Commissioners did not agree, sent to Lord Russell a long memorial on the subject.[17] Stephen, the first to read the letter and the enclosed memorial, minuted it expressing his opposition to the idea of separate reports. Russell agreed with Stephen: "This is a very inconvenient practice. In this case there is little dfference, but in others the harmony of the Commission might be destroyed by it. Inform Col. Torrens that as a Commissioner he can only act with his colleagues, and that any paper of his not agreed to by them, can only be considered as the letter of a private individual . . . "[18] Meanwhile Elliot had "learned accidentally" of

[16]The first instance which was found of the new method was a minute by Walcott, October 1872. C.O. 386/78, p. 106.

[17]*Vide infra.* The minute book records on this matter: 13 April—draft re Port Essington. Commrs. disagree. 18 April—finished report on Port Essington. C.O. 386/140.

[18]Torrens to Russell, 20 April 1840. C.O. 384/58. A minute on the letter by Vernon Smith is, unfortunately, illegible.

Torrens' separate report, and with his colleague Villiers wrote to Stephen expressing their feeling that "such a course of proceeding tends to weaken our authority as a Board, and to diminish our usefulness to the Department under which we serve." This, they said, was Torrens' second offence. When the question of a secretary was under discussion Torrens had advocated a separate official for the South Australian Commission, instead of one for both. On that occasion the Commissioners had avoided a controversial correspondence. On this occasion, too, Elliot and Villiers declared, they had tried to maintain harmony; but they objected to their colleague's procedure and hoped that Lord Russell would restrain the Commissioners from making separate reports. Stephen greatly regretted this commencement of discord, but trusted it might be arrested. Russell was curt: "Inform these gentlemen that as it is not my intention to receive any separate report from one of the Commissioners only, I think it unnecessary to enter into correspondence upon an occurrence which I hope will not again take place."[19] The matter was thereupon dropped, but the unity of the Board had been impaired.

Before the year ended Colonel Torrens sought to leave the Commission; on December 15 he tendered his resignation to Lord Russell on the ground that he held land in South Australia and so should not be a member of the South Australian Commission. Russell accepted, with the option that Torrens could retain his post if he disposed of his land.[20] The resignation was believed to apply to both Commissions, and it was intimated that it would take effect as soon as the parliamentary

[19]Elliot and Villiers to Stephen, 22 or 23 April 1840. *Ibid.* A reply was sent as directed by Russell, 2 May.

[20]"Not long after his appointment to the new Commission, [Torrens] entered into correspondence with Lord John Russell on the propriety of resigning his seat in consequence of having interest in some land in South Australia to the value of £1000 . . . All that Colonel Torrens could obtain was permission to hold office temporarily." Hodder, *History of South Australia,* I. 124.

inquiry on South Australia closed. Four months later the *Colonial Gazette* reported that "it is understood that Colonel Torrens has resigned his seat";[21] but it was not until July 20, 1841, that the *London Gazette* announced the appointment of John George Shaw Lefevre to the two Commissions replacing Colonel Robert Torrens retired.[22] This was the first change in the personnel of the Emigration Board.[23]

With the appointment of Lefevre, who also held a post on the Board of Trade, the Commission was reconstituted with two salaried members, Elliot and Villiers, and the third unpaid.[24] A complete rearrangement of the establishment was

[21]*Op. cit.*, April 7, 1841; p. 213. Torrens had apparently been involved in a controversy with Palmer a short time before.

[22]*Ibid.*, July 21, 1841; p. 460. The new commission to Elliot, Villiers and Lefevre, dated 19 July 1841, is in C.O. 386/2. It begins as does the original Emigration commission of 1840 and, except for the revocation of that commission and the necessary change of names, is identical with it. It is countersigned by Russell.

[23]Sir John George Shaw-Lefevre, K.C.B., was born in London, 24 January 1797; educated at Eton and Cambridge; called to the bar 1825; in 1832 selected by government to settle the divisions of the counties for the Reform Act; in 1833 chosen by Stanley (later Earl of Derby) to be parliamentary under-secretary at the Colonial Office; in 1834 appointed one of the three commissioners to carry the Poor Law Amendment Act into effect; gazetted as one of the Commissioners for South Australia, 5 May 1835; health impaired, appointed to the Board of Trade as joint assistant secretary in 1841; from 1841 to 1846 a member of the Emigration Board; in 1845 served on the South Australia committee; appointed deputy clerk of the parliaments in 1848, and clerk in 1855; continued to serve on many committees; retired on pension, 6 March 1875; died 20 August 1879. Lefevre was connected with the founding of London University and served as vice-chancellor 1842-62. He knew fourteen languages! (*D.N.B.*, XVII. 1389-1390. The account gives his appointment to the Emigration Commission as of 1843.) Hodder points out that in the passage of the South Australian bill through parliament (1834) Mr. Whitmore, Colonel Torrens, and Mr. Shaw-Lefevre were conspicuous by their labors. (*George Fife Angas*, p. 104.) Lefevre's appointment, it will be noted, thus retained the connection with the original South Australian Commission.

[24]C.O. to Treasury, 29 July 1841. C.O. 384/68. See also C.O. 386/27, pp. 257-258; and *Colonial Gazette*, 28 July 1841; p. 471. This change meant a saving of £1000.

then taken under consideration. This seemed necessary for two reasons: one of the salaried members had been reduced, and the special Commission for South Australia, it appeared, was soon to cease its separate existence. Villiers and Lefevre accordingly submitted a tentative schedule for the union of the two departments, the amalgamated establishment to cost £5090.[25]

This brought up a second problem: how was this increased expense to be borne? Hitherto the South Australian Commission had been paid from the funds of that colony, while the Emigration Board received an annual grant of £1000 from parliament, the balance of its expenses being paid out of New South Wales funds "subject to ulterior adjustment."[26] Stephen pointed out that although much of the Emigration Commissioners' time and labor had been devoted to the service of New South Wales and the other land-selling colonies, yet they had "also been extensively employed in the general superintendence of emigration to British North America, and in matters concerning land and emigration in the West Indies and in other colonies in which no Land Fund appropriated by the Crown is raised." Russell, he believed, was of the opinion that the most equitable plan would be to divide the expense among the land selling colonies as near as might be according to the time that the Commissioners spent on each and to assess the balance in the parliamentary estimate. Russell himself, however, was undecided; it was too early to say in what proportion the expense should be borne, nor was the whole scope of the Commission fully developed.[27] Before any decision was

[25]The schedule, dated 2 August 1841, called for ten secretaries and clerks, and £250 extra for copyists. C.O. 384/68. South Australia had fallen upon evil days, and the parliamentary investigation, then under way, foreshadowed the abolition of the South Australian Commission.

[26]Parliament also bore the expense of the corps of emigration officers. See the annual estimates submitted by the Commissioners in C.O. 384/62 and 73.

[27]In a minute preceding Russell's Vernon Smith had been somewhat hostile to the Commission; it was not doing all that was expected of it,

reached Melbourne's government fell from office, and the matter was dropped for several weeks. The new Colonial Secretary, Lord Stanley,[28] after some further correspondence, finally arrived at a settlement of the financial problem: the expense of the South Australian establishment, now to become the South Australian Division of the Emigration Office, would continue to be paid out of South Australian funds until the acts relating to that colony were repealed; but the expense of the general branch of the Office, after deducting what was provided for by parliamentary grant, would be apportioned among the colonies in Australia and New Zealand according to the receipts from land in each during the calendar year.[29]

The amalgamation of the two Commissions, however, was not completed until the early part of 1843. The South Australian office officially ceased to function as a separate unit at the end of September 1842,[30] and in February of the following year the Emigration Commissioners submitted the arrangements necessary for the consolidation of the two. Of the South Australian staff five clerks, the treasurer and an accountant were to be released; two clerks, Alfred and Chant, were to be transferred to the Emigration Office, and three, Gliddon, Cooper and Makeham, were to be retained in the South Australian Division to attend to the pressure of business there. Because of the great volume of correspondence carried on by the Board[31] small increases were proposed for six

and a parliamentary committee, he held, would be the only relief. But Russell wrote: "The Commission has been exceedingly useful, and in my opinion is a most valuable assistance to the Secretary of State—and so much the more valuable, as it is not independent of him." C.O. 384/68.

[28]On September 6, 1841, a circular notified the colonial governors that Stanley had taken the seals of the Colonial Department. G. 110, p. 364.

[29]C.O. to Commrs., 11 December 1841. C.O. 384/68.

[30]Act 5&6 Vict., c. 61 made South Australia an ordinary colony under the Colonial Office, and took all separate authority away from the South Australian Commissioners.

[31]Total of all correspondence, despatched—received.

1840	2606	6090	
1841	4271	4370	
1842	5565	4700.	C.O. 384/76.

clerks; three were to receive £30 and three £20 additional. The new establishment was to be[32]

	Present Salary	Proposed		Present Salary	Proposed
Elliot	£1000	£1000	Chant	£150	£180
Villiers	1000	1000	Miller	100	120
Lefevre	—	—	Lewes	100	120
Walcott	600	600	Alfred	70	100
Walpole	350	350	Cooper	70	100
Gliddon	350	350	Makeham	30	50
Engelbach	180	180	Messengers, etc..		800
				£4000	£4950

At the same time the method of sharing the expense of this amalgamated Board was again taken under consideration. It had previously been arranged that the South Australian Division would continue to be paid from that colony's funds (£500); parliament would continue the grant of £1000 which it had voted annually since 1837 for the Emigration Office; and any remaining expense would be divided among the land selling colonies. Two objections were now offered to this proposal. Land sales in the colonies fluctuated greatly and were not to be relied upon too fully as a source of income. In the second place, could parliament fairly tax these colonies? Only Australia and New Zealand had lands which were sold by the Commissioners; other colonies attracted much of their time and labor, but afforded them no funds. The Emigration Board accordingly asked if the balance should not most properly be paid in the United Kingdom. After some consideration the authorities adopted this suggestion, and thenceforth the whole

[32]Commrs. to Stephen, 25 February 1843. C.O. 384/76. The expense of the previous establishments had been

	1840	1841	1842 (¾yr.)
S. A. Commission	£3080. 9. 9	£2262. 2. 3	£1416. 9. 1
C.L.&E. Commission	4544. 6. 7	4012.12. 5	3871.19. 4
	£7624.16. 4	£6274.14. 8	£5288. 8. 5

expense was levied in a parliamentary vote.[33] On April 25, 1843, Commons voted the sum of £11,286 to 31 March, 1844, to defray the "charge of the Board and other Expenses connected with Emigration from this country."[34] Each year thereafter a sum, varying from £25,331 to £1,742, was included in the budget. For the next thirty-five years there was but the one board in Great Britain for the supervision of land sales and emigration throughout the Empire.

The death of Edward Villiers at the end of October, 1843, caused the second change in the Commission.[35] The vacancy was filled a month later by the appointment of Charles Alexander Wood.[36] Thereafter Lefevre appeared at but rare intervals in the work of the Commission, devoting most of his time to his salaried position on the Board of Trade. Finally in the spring of 1846 he resigned from the Colonial Land and Emigration Board and was replaced, on the same day, by Frederic Rogers.[37] The new Commissioner found his col-

[33]Commrs. to Stephen, 22 February 1843; C.O. to Commrs., 22 March. C.O. 384/76.

[34]*Commons Journals,* XCVIII. 217. For 1840 and 1841 the votes had been £3540, and for 1842 £5092. All these sums included the cost of the establishment at the outports. For a complete list see App. 5.

[35]He was active in the Commission up to the first of September. His death occurred on October 30. C.O. 384/76. C.O. 386/48, p. 140.

[36]C.O. 384/82. The third commission to Elliot, Lefevre and Wood, dated 28 November 1843, is identical, *mutatis mutandis,* with that of 1841, except for the last few sentences relating to South Australia which are omitted, the separate commission for that colony now being ended. The document is countersigned by Stanley. C.O. 386/2. Wood began his duties about 8 December. C.O. 384/76.

[37]C.O. 386/140, p. 36. The resignation, dated 19 May 1846 and addressed to Gladstone, then Colonial Secretary, is in C.O. 384/77. It runs in part: "In accordance with your permission and with a view to enable me to devote my attention more effectually and conveniently to the duties with which I am charged at the Board of Trade . . . " The fourth commission to Elliot, Wood and Rogers, 19 May 1846, is identical, *mutatis mutandis,* with that of 1843; it is countersigned by Gladstone. C.O. 386/2. —Frederic Rogers, Baron Blachford, was born at Marylebone, 31 January 1811; attended Eton, where he was a contemporary of Gladstone and

leagues, Elliot and Wood, "both very warm and pleasant; we soon got our feet on the fender."[38] With his appointment the minute book was briefly resumed; on May 21 Rogers attended his first Board meeting and was present at all subsequent sessions up to July 7, 1846, when the record again abruptly terminates.[39]

The appointment of a new Commissioner was again made the occasion for a rearrangement of the Board. Like his predecessor, Rogers held a second office, that of Assistant Under-Secretary of State in the Colonial Department; his duties as Commissioner were, accordingly, limited, and his salary was fixed at half that of his colleagues (£500). Except during the absence from London of one or other of his colleagues, Rogers was to assist chiefly in cases where a third or deciding voice was necessary; during absences he was to

Hallam, and then Oxford; B.A. 1832; M.A. 1835; B.C.L. 1838; fellow of Oriel College 1833-45; studied law and was called to the bar 1837; went to London, summer of 1842, and became leader writer for the *Times;* in 1844 gave up writing and began his official life as registrar of joint stock companies (his chief was Lefevre); less than two years later was appointed Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioner and Assistant Under-Secretary in the Colonial Office; married in September 1847; served on an important mission to Paris, 1858-9, on the coolie question; was intended as Stephen's successor, and in May 1860 did succeed Merivale as Permanent Under-Secretary; held this office until 1871; served on a few commissions after that date, but dwelt for the most part on his estate in Devonshire; died at Blachford, Devon, 21 November 1889. *D.N.B.,* XVII. 119-120. Marindin, *Letters of Frederic Lord Blachford, passim.*

[38]Marindin, p. 131 (quoting letter). See also *ibid.,* p. 117.

[39]C.O. 386/140, pp. 30-52. Eighteen meetings are recorded, five in May, eleven in June and two in July. It is of interest to note that on June 2 of that year (1846) Colonel Torrens brought Stephen a book and asked to be reinstated as Commissioner "from which place he was dismissed by Lord John Russell," or else be granted a pension; he referred briefly to "his controversy with Messrs. Elliot and Villiers which led to his removal." Stephen and Gladstone, after briefly considering the request, informed the Colonel that government did not contemplate a fourth Commissioner. C.O. 384/77.

take the place of the absent member.[40] When all three were present Elliot, as senior, was to be chairman. Wood, the third member of the Board, was to have as his special field the consideration of legal questions and documents; Secretary Gladstone wrote: "on him I shall chiefly rely for guidance on all enquiries respecting the Law which you may have occasion to bring under my notice."[41]

The arrangement of having one Commissioner hold two offices did not, however, prove satisfactory in practice, and was dropped at the end of six months. Early in the crisis brought on by the great Irish famine the Colonial Office found that the Commission did not have the means to dispatch business as promptly as should be done. For this no blame could be attached to the Board; on the contrary the great pressure of business was responsible, and this pressure was likely to increase still more in the coming season (1847). As an immediate change was necessary, the logical step was that the third member who hitherto had been able to act only occasionally should be relieved from his duties as Assistant Under-Secretary to devote himself exclusively to the Commission. Rogers accordingly ceased to hold his post in the Colonial Office after 9 January, 1847; but part of his work there, that of examining and reporting on laws passed in the colonies, was transferred to the Emigration Board with him. "In future all colonial laws [will] be referred to you for your report in the same manner that business connected with the management of Colonial Lands and of Emigration now is." This was a very important addition to the work performed by the Commission.

[40]The Commissioners, however, were to have only their regular vacation of two months.

[41]C.O. to Commrs., 6 June 1846. C.O. 384/77. Gladstone wrote in the margin of the draft: "it has been understood that in case of an extraordinary pressure of business Mr. Rogers might be called in" to assist in the work of the Board.—Gladstone had succeeded Stanley as Colonial Secretary on 23 December 1845; in July 1847 Earl Grey took his place. G. 122, pp. 475-476.

It was further arranged that the Commissioners, in order to divide their time and business, might report singly upon matters referred to them. Their instructions were therefore altered to allow the sending of reports with only one signature. It was left entirely to the judgment of the Commissioners to determine what cases might thus be disposed of singly, and which were of such magnitude as to require joint deliberation. It was felt that this necessitated a chairman for the Board, and Elliot, the senior member, was naturally assigned to that position.[42] The Commissioners, in acknowledging the receipt of Secretary Grey's new instructions, expressed their earnest hope that this reconstruction of the Board might "prove conducive to the prompt and adequate discharge of public business."[43] After the lapse of four and a half years the Commission once again consisted of three full time members—a change which had been rendered necessary by the great increase of emigration during the famine years.

At about the same time some changes were made in the office establishment. The enormous pressure of emigration in 1846 and the early part of 1847 had more than doubled the volume of business, yet the staff had worked faithfully and kept the accounts without an error. Such fidelity and efficiency surely merited a reward. A schedule was accordingly presented and approved, providing for salary increases to the extent of £370,[44] and for the appointment of a new clerk "in consequence

[42]C.O. to Commrs., 9 January 1847. C.O. 384/80. Rogers' full salary was now to be borne on the estimate of the Commission. Six months earlier Elliot had been designated to act as chairman when the three members of the Board were present; *vide supra*, p. 71.

[43]Commrs. to Grey, 12 January 1847. C.O. 384/80. A few weeks later (3 February) Grey wrote to the Commrs. directing them to prepare on the 1st and 15th of each month a list of all subjects referred to them by the C.O. which were unanswered; causes of the delay were to be stated if more than fourteen days had elapsed. *Ibid.*

[44]Since 1840 the Board had expended or handled £230,000.—The previous establishment of three Commissioners, secretary, and nine clerks cost £5320; the new schedule of three Commissioners, secretary, four first-class,

of the business of reporting on Colonial Acts and Ordinances devolving on this Board."[45]

The increased volume of business also lent emphasis to another matter—that of superannuation of members of the staff. Since 1837 the emigration establishment had been provisional, but now that its permanency seemed assured the Commissioners suggested that the office might be added to the schedule of the superannuation act. Some weeks later a formal application was submitted, asking that all members of the emigration staff be placed upon the list from the date of commencement of service upon the payment of arrears. The Treasury gave its approval and issued the necessary warrant.[46]

Towards the end of 1847 the fourth change was made in the personnel of the Commission. Elliot, the chairman, was appointed Assistant Under-Secretary of State in the Colonial Office,[47] and was succeeded, both as Commissioner and chairman, by Thomas William Clinton Murdoch (27 November).[48]

and six second-class clerks called for an immediate increase of £370 and a maximum increase of £680. Commrs. to Stephen, 12 March 1847. C.O. 384/80. The letter was signed by Elliot and Rogers only. Grey and Hawes believed all three should have signed; after a talk with Elliot, however, Grey was prepared to recommend the letter to the Treasury. Commissioner Wood sent a note expressing his tacit acquiescence (18 March); he differed from his colleagues only on one or two minor points. The explanation satisfied Grey. *Ibid.*

[45]A Mr. Deane was appointed at a salary of £80. Commrs. to Merivale, 8 June 1848. C.O. 384/82. The appointment was from April 1847.

[46]Commrs. to Stephen, 12 March and 9 June 1847; C.O. to Commrs., 20 July. C.O. 384/80. *Commons Journals,* CII. 957. The warrant, dated 22 July 1847, is in C.O. 386/3. A double deduction was to be made from the salaries until the arrears were paid off. The superannuation act was 4&5 Will. IV, c. 24.

[47]The appointment was a result of changes consequent on the retirement, through ill-health, of James Stephen, the Permanent Under-Secretary. Herman Merivale succeeded to Stephen's post.

[48]C.O. 384/80. The fifth commission to Murdoch, Wood and Rogers, 27 November 1847, is again identical, *mutatis mutandis,* with that of 1846; it is countersigned by Grey. Note that the name of the new member precedes the others (as chairman). C.O. 386/2. Sir Thomas William Clinton Murdoch was born in London, 22 March 1809; entered the Colonial Office as

"In consequence of the increased amount and importance of the business devolving upon [the] Office" the chairman was now to receive £1200 per annum.[49] The conduct of business, however, was to be left unchanged: "it is intended that all the general arrangements for the transaction of business which have taken place in pursuance of my [Grey's] letter of the 9th of January, 1847, should continue in force . . . "[50] Walcott, the secretary of the Commission, soon afterwards received an increase in salary from £650 to £800 per annum, in virtue of his "utmost zeal, devotion, and ability." Elliot forwarded the recommendation to his chief with the remark: "I cannot too earnestly submit this recommendation to favorable consideration. Mr. Walcott is one of the most devoted public servants I know, who has long been working early and late, without complaint and without ostentation, from pure zeal to discharge his duty and carry on the service successfully . . . " Grey added his "strong recommendation."[51]

junior clerk, 5 August 1826; in September 1839 went out with Sir George Arthur to Canada as chief secretary; returned to the Colonial Office in 1842, and four years later became senior clerk; appointed chairman of Emigration Commission, November 1847; in 1870 visited Canada on a mission connected with free grants to settlers and Red River matters; went to the United States to discuss question of offences committed on British passenger ships to that country; created K.C.M.G., 1870; retired on pension, December 1876; died in London, 30 November 1891. *D.N.B.*, XIII. 1221. See also C.O. 384/82 and P.P. ♯46.II (1848), p. 283.

[49]Commrs. to Hawes, 8 December 1847; and Hawes to Commrs., 28 December. C.O. 384/80.

[50]Grey to Commrs., 30 December 1847. *Ibid.*

[51]Commrs. to Merivale, 24 February 1848. C.O. 384/82. Walcott had been appointed secretary in 1840 at £600, and raised to £650 in 1847. The increase of his duties is indicated by the volume of correspondence handled:

	1844	1845	1846	1847	1848 (est.)
Letters received	2171	2517	3741	10305	24000
Letters despatched	2065	2773	4129	10762	22000

The parliamentary grants, it might be noted, had risen sharply in these years. For the fiscal year 1846-7 it had been £10,364. The Commrs.' estimate for 1847-8 called for £11,308. 6. 4; because of the great distress and abnormal conditions that year, however, the actual vote was increased to

Not only did the increased pressure of business lead to higher salaries, but further accommodation also was required. The one house in Park Street was far too small for the enlarged establishment; there were now twenty-two clerks exclusive of the secretary and his assistant. The Commissioners accordingly asked permission to acquire the house across the street at £170 per annum, charging the sum to New South Wales, South Australia and the Cape of Good Hope. Lord Grey gave his sanction, and the Treasury added its final approval on condition that the new house be engaged only from year to year and that the funds be provided by the colonies to which emigration was directed.[52] The additional space, 15 Park Street, was then secured, but at £120, not £170, per annum. Three years' trial, however, showed this division of the office to be very inconvenient, and the Commissioners were greatly pleased when, towards the end of July, 1851, the owner of 9 Park Street offered them the house next door (No. 8) which was large enough to accommodate the whole establishment. The rent was £500, an increase of £80 over the combined rents of the two houses, but from this could be deducted £55, the hire of one housekeeper which would be saved, leaving a deficit of £25 to be paid from Australian funds. Both the Colonial Secretary and the Treasury gave their approval to the transfer of the offices to 8 Park Street, where they remained until 1874.[53]

Meanwhile the business of the Emigration Board was rapidly expanding. For example, in the spring of 1848 the Commis-

£23,815. 1. 4. For 1848-9 the estimate and vote decreased to £13,451. 6. 2. (C.O. 386/52, pp. 233-234; C.O. 386/54, pp. 388-392. *Commons Journals,* CI. 1070; CII. 597; CIII. 961.)

[52]Commrs. to Merivale, 3 March 1848. C.O. 384/80. C.O. to Commrs., 26 April 1848. C.O. 384/82. N.S.W., S.A. and the Cape were the colonies to which such a large volume of government emigration was being sent, work which required many additional clerks.

[53]The original house (No. 9) rented for £300, paid from the parliamentary grant; the additional house (No. 15) for £120, paid from colonial funds. Commrs. to Merivale, 25 July 1851. C.O. 384/86. Approved 1 October.

sioners estimated that their correspondence that year would total 24,000 letters received and 22,000 dispatched; the actual figures were 42,891 and 36,719![54] This unexpected increase of 75 per cent. was largely due to the fluctuating assisted emigration to the Australian colonies. So great had the volume of that emigration become, that the regular staff of eleven clerks was quite unable to handle the correspondence involved, and a temporary staff of extra clerks had to be employed. By 1849 there were some thirty of these clerks working by the day; three years later the number was practically the same. It was probable that some of them might be in the office for several years, yet they could not be attached to the permanent staff. In view of their precarious tenure the Commissioners recommended and secured for these employees tangible increases in their daily wages.[55] Another change of this period was the creation of a distinct department in the Board for the handling of accounts. Engelbach had been in charge of this work with Lewes as his assistant; because of the great responsibility they were under it was agreed to raise their salaries to £400 and £250 respectively. Cooper, who had done very good work in the Assisted Emigration Division, was also rewarded with an increase to £200, rising to £250.[56]

The years between 1853 and 1857 marked a turning-point in the history of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission. The Passengers Act was brought to a form so near perfection that no important alteration was made between 1855 and 1870. The staff of emigration officers at the outports of the United Kingdom reached its maximum and began to decline. The volume of emigration, after reaching its maximum

[54]Commrs. to Merivale, 12 February 1849. C.O. 384/84.

[55]Commrs. to C.O., 27 April 1852. C.O. 384/89.

[56]Commrs. to Merivale, 5 January and 12 February 1849. C.O. 384/84. The three clerks had been receiving £180, £120 and £100 respectively.—The estimate for 1849-50 called for £13,554. 5, a net increase of £102.18.10 over the previous year. C.O. 386/56, pp. 128ff.

expansion in 1852, began to contract. The Australian colonies upon the grant of responsible self-government were taking steps to handle the assisted emigration through their own agents. All this meant that within the Commission itself there was a change; their duties reached a peak and then began to decrease, so that the next twenty years are a story of contraction. On July 20, 1853, S. H. Northcote, T. W. C. Murdoch, and C. E. Trevelyan were appointed a commission to inquire into the Emigration Board. Their report, presented August 10, after relating the history of the Board since 1831 gave an account of the Commissioners' duties, supported by statistics to illustrate the volume of work accomplished.

> The administration of the Office [it was pointed out] is carried on partly by a fixed establishment, paid out of the Parliamentary vote, and partly by a body of Extra Clerks paid out of Colonial Funds. . . . This division is rendered necessary by the circumstance that the Office is maintained with a view partly to Imperial and partly to Colonial interests; and the funds derived from the Colonies being subject to the fluctuations which have already been noticed, it is clearly expedient that the fixed part of the Establishment should be charged upon the Imperial Revenues, and that the Colonial remittances should be drawn upon for the payment of the Extra Clerks, whose number may be augmented or reduced at a short notice, as circumstances require.

The importance of the report, however, lay in its recommendations; the three investigators recommended that the present Board of three Commissioners be replaced by a single Chief Commissioner at £1200 and an Assistant Commissioner at £1000, and that the salaries of the assistant secretary and accountant be a minimum of £500 each to rise by £20 a year to £600. The permanent establishment at this time (1853) consisted of fourteen officers and clerks and cost £6660 annually—(three Commissioners £3200, secretary £800, assistant secretary £500, accountant £400, and eight clerks £1760). The office as proposed by the report would consist of

	Minimum salary	Maximum
Two Commissioners	£2200	£2200
Secretary	800	800
Assistant secretary	500	600
Accountant	500	600
Three first-class clerks	900	1500
Five second-class clerks	500	1500

This staff of thirteen would cost a minimum of £5400 and a maximum of £7200.[57] The Duke of Newcastle, then Colonial Secretary, saw "no reason to differ from the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry." The Treasury Lords also approved the alterations suggested and authorized their being carried into effect—except for the reduction in the number of Commissioners—from the commencement of that quarter (1 October 1853). The change in Commissioners should come whenever a vacancy occurred.[58]

Before any reduction was made, however, another department was added to the establishment—a Statistical Department. The Register-General had urged that statistical tables be prepared by the Commissioners from the returns made to them. The latter, upon receipt of authority from the Colonial Office, at once organized a department for that purpose, and asked the Board of Customs to send them all returns of passenger ships since 1 January 1853, with similar returns in future at short intervals. From these statistics the desired tables would be prepared.[59]

Then the Australian gold rush intervened to keep the temporary establishment at a large figure, and postponed indefinitely any possibility of reduction. This continued until 1857; then the end came nearer. On the first of March that year the Emigration Board consisted of three Commissioners,

[57]Report of Murdoch, Trevelyan and Northcote, 10 August 1853. Printed in P.P. #695 (1853), pp. 266-273.

[58]*Ibid.* and C.O. 384/91.

[59]Commrs. to Merivale, 13 December 1853. C.O. 386/117, pp. 322-323.

fourteen clerks on the permanent establishment and forty-nine extra clerks paid out of colonial funds.[60] The peak had been reached, and now the decline set in. The Australian colonies had grown to manhood, they had received constitutions which provided for self-government, and now, very conscious of their new dignity and powers, began to take steps to bring the control of immigration into their own hands. There was talk of appointing their own agents for that purpose in the United Kingdom and of no longer entrusting to the Imperial Board the conduct of emigration assisted out of Australian funds.[61] This seemed an opportune time to put into effect the reduction recommended by the Commission of Inquiry in 1853, and in the spring of 1857 the first contraction was made. "In consequence of the probable transfer of the selection of emigrants for Australia from this Board to agents appointed by the several Australian colonies, it has been thought right to reduce the number of the commissioners and this Report [Seventeenth] will consequently bear two signatures only."[62] C. A. Wood retired from the Board, leaving chairman Murdoch and his colleague Rogers. Some changes in routine were necessarily made; general reports and cheques were hereafter to bear one signature instead of two, but the notices issued under the Passengers Act which by law required two signatures were to continue to bear two.[63]

[60]Commrs. to Merivale, 5 January 1858. C.O. 386/118, pp. 421-424. Another report gives the temporary staff as 37 in the middle of July. Murdoch to Merivale, 21 July 1857. C.O. 384/98.—The estimate for 1855-6, it might be noted, called for £26,119.14. 0, a sum nearly double that for 1849-50. The amount voted, however, was £16,720. C.O. 384/94.

[61]All these agents were not immediately appointed. *Vide infra.*

[62]Report 17, p. 49. Dated 27 April 1857.

[63]Murdoch and Rogers to Merivale, 2 April 1857. C.O. 386/118, pp. 353-355. Wood's retirement was from that date; he was the senior member, having been commissioned on 28 November 1843. A new commission, the sixth, was issued, 2 June 1857, to Murdoch and Rogers (now Sir Frederic, Baronet) reconstituting them as Commissioners. Except for a slight change in the wording of the revocation of the previous (1847) commission, it is identical with the others; countersigned by Labouchere. C.O. 386/2.

The extra clerks in the office were next in line for reduction. Again in view of the probable transfer at an early date of the conduct of a large portion of the Australian emigration to agents appointed by the colonies, notice was given to the clerks paid out of the funds of those colonies that their services might soon end.[64] The Colonial Secretary was interested in the subject of reduction and wrote for further details; "Mr. Labouchere would be glad to be informed in what manner you propose that the strength of your office should be reduced as the work is found to diminish."[65] In reply the Commissioners pointed out the reduction that had already taken place. Of the forty-nine extra clerks on their staff on March 1, 1857, seven had been released by October 1, two more by December 15, four others on January 1, and five more were to go at the end of that month. The other thirty-one would be dispensed with whenever the state of business would allow. The only change in the Australian work which so far had taken place was in the extension of the remittance system. As no great reduction of business was anticipated, it would be inexpedient to reduce any further at present.[66]

These reductions in the temporary staff did not materially affect the parliamentary vote which was used for the support of the permanent establishment only. Nevertheless, from 1853 onwards there was a steady downward trend, as the following figures will illustrate: for the fiscal year 1853-4 £17,396; 1854-5 £16,840; 1855-6 £16,720; 1856-7 £14,582; 1857-8 £13,424.[67] The Board's estimate for 1858-9 may be given in detail, as it is the last to be found for some time:

[64]Murdoch and Rogers to Merivale, 26 November 1857. C.O. 384/99. One of these clerks, Foulds, who had served for ten years, was to join the class of permanent extra clerks after his colonial service ended.

[65]C.O. to Commrs., 15 December 1857. *Ibid.*

[66]Commrs. to Merivale, 5 January 1858. C.O. 386/118, pp. 421-424.

[67]*Commons Journals,* CVIII. 511; CIX. 340; CX. 215; CXI. 142; CXII. 285. Up to 1855 the vote had been for the Board, officers at the ports and "certain expenses in the colonies connected with emigration"; from 1856 the phrase "in the colonies" is omitted.

Chairman	£1200
Commissioner	1000
Secretary and establishment	4188.12.11
Contingencies	150
Emigration officers	5126
Relief for ships putting back	150
Prosecutions under Passengers Act	100
Chaplains at the four Emigration Depots	300
Hospital at Queenstown	300
Agency in New Brunswick	200
	£12714.12.11

This represented a decrease of some £710 over the previous year.[68]

At this point, unfortunately, there is a gap in the records of the Emigration Commission for a period of ten years.[69] The parliamentary votes for this decade, however, indicate a steady contraction in the emigration establishment:[70]

Fiscal year 1858-59	£12,828	Fiscal year 1865-66	£10,531
1859-60	12,708	1866-67	7,418
1860-61	11,472	1867-68	8,036
1861-62	10,090	1868-69	9,231
1862-63	10,834	1869-70	9,500
1863-64	6,720	1870-71	8,545
1864-65	7,720	1871-72	7,345

[68]Murdoch and Rogers to Merivale, 6 March 1858. C.O. 386/118, pp. 433-436. The parliamentary vote for the year (1858-9) was slightly higher than the estimate—£12,828.

[69]Only two clues could be found for the disappearance of these documents. Gill, one of the clerks, in a letter of 19 April 1877 refers to "the destruction of many of our old official records on our removal from Park Street to the new buildings" (*i. e.* the Colonial Office). C.O. 386/2. In an entry-book of letters many items are rubber-stamped "Destroyed under Statute." C.O. 485/1, *2.* (These volumes cover the years 1872-1880 but the same fate may have befallen letters of the earlier period. Is it to this that Gill refers?) The letter-books of the Commissioners for some of the colonies are complete, but all the original documents for the years 1858 to 1871 inclusive seem to have disappeared.

[70]*Commons Journals,* CXIII. 305; CXIV. 319; CXV. 480; CXVI. 369; CXVII. 261; CXVIII. *322*; CXIX. 339; CXX. 358; CXXI. 312; CXXII. 389; CXXIII. 300; CXXIV. 379; CXXV. 385; CXXVI. 428-429.

One important change took place; Sir Frederic Rogers left the Emigration Board to succeed Merivale as Permanent Under-Secretary of State in the Colonial Office. He was succeeded as Commissioner by Stephen Walcott, 21 July 1860, who henceforth filled both that office and his previous one of secretary.[71] Five members of the staff retired—Walpole, Gliddon, Lewes, Chant and Miller—and two new clerks—Pownall and Gill—were added to the service.

In 1871 it is possible to resume the narrative. The establishment was slowly dwindling away. Early in that year W. H. Herbert, a supplementary clerk in the Emigration Office who acted as statistical clerk, died and the Commissioners undertook "to do what they [could] for the future performance of [his] duty" without filling the position.[72] A year later the establishment of the Board numbered but twelve—two Commissioners, assistant secretary, accountant, three first-class clerks, two second-class, office-keeper, housekeeper and messenger.[73]

The duties of the Board had now greatly decreased. The Australian colonies had appointed their own agents, and the emigration conducted by the Board had practically ceased. In their Thirtieth Report the Commissioners pointed out that their "operations so far as regards the selection of emigrants and the chartering of ships for the Australian colonies [had] come, at least for a time, to a close."[74] In 1870 they sent out but 126 persons, in 1871 about 250, and in 1872 some 490. Chinese emigration to the West Indies was entirely suspended. The staff of officers at the ports of the United Kingdom was being reduced year by year. But despite the great contraction in the work performed by the Board since the decade of the '50s, its functions were not yet ended by any means. When the Colonial Office at this time (February 1872) considered

[71]C.O. 386/7. There is no indication that a new commission was issued.

[72]Murdoch to Rogers, 6 February 1871. C.O. 386/119, p. 133. This reduced the cost of the office by £220.

[73]C.O. 384/101.

[74]*Op. cit.*, p. 11.

further reduction or total abolition of the Board, Commissioner Murdoch, at the request of Lord Kimberley, pointed out several problems which must first be solved. The Passengers Act entrusted the execution of its provisions to "The Emigration Commissioners" and for certain notices to be issued under it required the signature of two Commissioners. Therefore until it was otherwise provided by parliament there must be two officers bearing the title of "Emigration Commissioners," and if the present office were abolished it would be necessary to issue a commission to two other officers to execute those duties. It was now proposed to transfer the execution of the Passengers Act to the Board of Trade; if that were done three important duties would remain to the Emigration Office.

"1st To report on questions connected with land in the colonies referred to it by the Secretary of State." This formerly involved a large amount of labor, but had been much reduced by the transfer of the Crown lands in the more important colonies to the colonial governments. Only with reference to the smaller and less important colonies did such questions now arise, though even these were sometimes quite troublesome.

"2 To deal with matters relating to Indian, Chinese and other Emigration." The general superintendence of Indian emigration had from the first given cause for many elaborate reports from the Board, as well as for considerable correspondence with the agents in India and others; the Board had also from time to time as requested chartered ships, selected surgeons, and purchased and sent out clothing for the service. As regards Chinese emigration there had been practically a suspension of correspondence since 1869. The office had likewise been called upon for reports on South Sea Island emigration to Queensland and elsewhere, and on emigration from Britain to Brazil, Buenos Ayres, Venezuela and other places. It was also engaged in conducting a small emigration, principally of female domestic servants, to New South Wales at the expense of the colony, and it collected and sent out when required small

bodies of emigrants to Western Australia. It also arranged for the emigration of commuted pensioners from the dockyards and arsenals.

3 To collect and publish such information respecting the British Colonies as may be useful to persons proposing to emigrate. . . . The collection and publication of information relating to the Colonies has heretofore included the compilation of statistics of the Emigration from this country, abstracts of which are supplied every quarter to the Registrar General—the publication of an Annual Report and of the "Colonization Circular"—and the issue of any notices or publications which may be approved for that purpose by the Secretary of State.

The transfer of the Passengers Act to the Board of Trade would permit of four reductions in the Emigration Office. First, one of the Commissioners could be abolished; but inasmuch as the senior Commissioner (Murdoch) had served upwards of forty-six years and would be entitled to a pension, the saving would not be great. Second, the accountant could be pensioned off and his duties transferred to the Accountant's Branch of the Colonial Office; but Engelbach, too, having served thirty-two years, would be entitled to a pension only one-third smaller than his salary. Third, the statistics of emigration could be transferred to the Board of Trade; but since they involved great labor, "returns called for by the House of Commons having more than once occupied nearly the whole Office for many months," and referred to about 1900 ships annually, it would probably be necessary to transfer one if not two clerks to the Board of Trade. Fourth, there would remain the reporting on land questions and emigration, and the publication of the Annual Report, the Colonization Circular and other papers for the information of the public. For these duties there would be the second Commissioner, the assistant secretary, and (say) one junior clerk. For the Annual Report, if continued, it would be necessary to obtain the statistics of emigration from the Board of Trade; the rest of the requisite information would be in the Colonial Office.

According to this scheme then six reductions might be made in the Emigration staff: one Commissioner (Murdoch, present salary £1200), accountant (Engelbach, £600), two clerks (Alfred and Makeham, £405 and £375), office-keeper and wife (£120), and messenger (£60). Alfred and Makeham had been thirty-five and thirty-two years in the service and, with the addition of years usual on abolition, would be entitled, like the accountant, to two-thirds pensions. The establishment to be retained would be: one Commissioner (Walcott, £1000), assistant secretary (Cooper, £600), and one clerk (Pownall, £230). Two clerks (Deane and Gill, £345 and £170) would be transferred to the Board of Trade.[75]

No immediate action was taken, but the Treasury did not forget the matter. A few months later when it became necessary to renew the lease of the house occupied by the Commissioners, Earl Kimberley proposed to confer with the Board of Works upon the renewal. The Treasury Lords suggested, "as a matter for conference between the Secretary of State and the President of the Board of Trade, whether it is probable that legislation will take place at an early period of such a nature as to admit of transferring the Establishment of the Emigration Commissioners, so far as it is retained, either to the Colonial Office or to the Board of Trade, thus dispensing with the need of the present building." Herbert, the Permanent Under-Secretary, replied that, even if the Passengers Act were transferred to the Board of Trade, it would still be necessary to provide room for several of the Emigration staff; the Colonial Office could not take in any more persons. "It may on the whole be preferable for various reasons not to move the

[75]Memo. by Sir T. W. C. Murdoch, 3 February 1872. C.O. 384/101. This was in general the plan subsequently followed. Murdoch gave the following statistics of correspondence:

	Col. Off.		General		Total	
Year	Recd.	Desp.	Recd.	Desp.	Recd.	Desp.
1870	446	288	5671	5195	6117	5483
1871	357	244	6896	6295	7253	6539

Emigration Commissioners from their present house until they can be received in the new Colonial Office building . . . "[76] Upon that basis the question was settled. The Lords Commissioners of the Treasury authorized "accommodation to be provided for [the Board] for a further period not exceeding that at which the new Colonial Office is likely to be ready for occupation"; and the Board of Works arranged for 8 Park Street to be held on annual tenancy.[77]

The transfer of the Emigration offices did not take place for some time. Murdoch in October of 1872 expressed the belief that the Board would be "brought under the same roof with the Colonial Office" within twelve months, but Herbert disagreed: "? I shall be surprised if it does not exceed that time."[78] Herbert was right. Exactly one year later H. M. Office of Works agreed with the landlord of the Commission's house to surrender the premises at Ladyday next, and arrangements were accordingly made for removal to the new government offices before that date.[79] About the middle of February 1874 the Emigration Board was finally installed in its new quarters in the Colonial Office building.[80]

Meanwhile the further reduction of the Board had been resumed. In the fall of 1872 the Merchant Shipping Act which had been under consideration for months was finally passed; it ordered the transfer to the Board of Trade, from 1 January 1873, of all the powers and duties of the Emigration Board

[76]Treasury to Holland, 17 May 1872; minute by R.G.W.H., 28 May. C.O. 384/100. See also letter from T. N. Farrer, of Board of Trade, to Herbert, 24 May: "We are quite ready to take over the shipping business of the Emigration Commissioners if we can get our Bill passed which will I hope be by the end of the Session . . . " *Ibid.*

[77]H. T. Holland to the Commrs., 8 June 1872; Board of Works to Treasury, 19 June. "This ends the question of accomodation for the present. W.I.H." *Ibid.*

[78]Murdoch to Herbert, 26 October; marginal note in pencil. *Ibid.*

[79]Murdoch to Herbert, 22 October 1873. C.O. 386/119, pp. 392-393. Ladyday was March 25, one of the quarter days on which rent is payable.

[80]C.O. 386/2.

under the Passengers Acts.[81] The first Board, as Murdoch had anticipated, applied to the Commissioners for a clerk of their staff, Deane, who was trained in the necessary office work.[82] With Deane's transfer the staff was reduced to the two Commissioners, assistant secretary, accountant and four clerks; no further reductions could be made until the Board was housed in the new offices. In fact the estimate for the fiscal year ending 31 March 1875 proposed an increase of £131, of which £56 was for a writer and the remainder for regular salary increases.[83]

The expected reduction upon the transfer to the new Colonial Office did not materialize, and many months passed before the death of one of the staff afforded another opportunity for contraction. When Richard B. Cooper, the assistant secretary, died his work was divided between the two Commissioners and Engelbach. The latter was now to be "Chief Clerk," while Gill was promoted to first class clerk and his salary raised from £210 to £300.[84]

In the spring of 1876 Commissioner Murdoch prepared to retire, and further plans for reduction of the Board were made.

As I understand that arrangements which are contemplated in the Colonial Office make it desirable that the Earl of Carnarvon should be at once informed as to my intentions in regard to retirement from Office, I beg to say that on the 4th August next I shall

[81]The emigration officers at the outports were now transferred to the Board of Trade. *Vide infra,* Chapter VI.

[82]Board of Trade to C.O., 13 August 1872; Walcott to Herbert, 2 September. C.O. 384/100.

[83]Estimate dated 10 November 1873. C.O. 384/101. An explanation of the increase proposed may be found in a letter from Murdoch to Herbert, 24 March 1873; since the first of the year there had been only four clerks in the office, but the correspondence handled amounted to 995 letters received and 819 dispatched. *Ibid.*

[84]Walcott to Herbert, 17 September 1875. Cooper died on 11 September; he had served under the South Australian Commission and the Board since January 1839. "He was a highly meritorious public servant, and we have lost in him a most efficient, useful and zealous officer." Murdoch to Herbert, 20 October 1875. Cooper's salary had been £600; after deducting Gill's increase it left a net saving of £510. C.O. 386/119, pp. 500-502.

complete fifty years in the public service and that I should wish to retire at anytime after that date most convenient to the Colonial Office, provided I am allowed the usual pension for that length of service.[85]

Lord Carnarvon expressed his very cordial concurrence in the high estimation in which Murdoch's services had been held by his predecessors, and his own strong personal sense of the loss which Her Majesty's government would sustain by his retirement.[86] Malcolm, one of the Assistant Under-Secretaries, sent a minute to Carnarvon informing him that "by an arrangement of long standing it has been settled that this vacancy is not to be filled up, and the establishment of the Commissioners is to be largely reduced."[87] In order to make the necessary arrangements to this end, the Colonial Office requested Murdoch to "furnish the particulars of the services of those gentlemen of your department who it is proposed shall retire at the same time with yourself and that you will also state what branches of the work of your department may be conveniently transferred to that of the Crown Agents for the Colonies or other departments."[88]

Murdoch's detailed reply again outlined the duties performed by the Board. First, general supervision of coolie emigration; the purchase and dispatch of clothing might be transferred to the Crown Agents, but the chartering of ships, selection of surgeons and other duties needed experienced hands. Second, emigration of pensioners from dockyards and arsenals; this called for much correspondence and knowledge

[85]Murdoch to Herbert, 3 April 1876. C.O. 384/112. Murdoch listed his career: entered C.O. as an extra clerk 4 August 1826; March 1835 appointed acting senior in North American Department in place of Elliot who was going to Canada as secretary to the Canada Commission; September 1839 went to Canada as chief secretary with Lord Sydenham; August 1842 returned to C.O.; September 1846 appointed precis writer; November 1847 appointed chairman of the Emigration Board; March 1870 went to Canada and the U. S. on a government mission.

[86]C.O. to Murdoch, 17 April 1876. C.O. 384/112; C.O. 485/1.

[87]C.O. 384/112.

[88]C.O. to Murdoch, 23 May 1876. *Ibid.*

of the colonies. Third, questions relating to schemes of emigration; issue of cautionary notices, etc. Fourth, the Colonization Circular which entailed much labor. Fifth, minor matters from time to time. For these latter duties he had no suggestions to offer. Then, turning to the possibilities of reducing the Board, he referred to the scheme submitted to the Earl of Kimberley in 1872. Since that time the assistant secretary had died; Engelbach, who held both that post and the accountantship, would be retained. Two clerks, Alfred and Makeham, would be retired on 31 December 1876, leaving in the Board one Commissioner (Walcott), the assistant secretary and accountant (Engelbach), and two clerks (Pownall and Gill).[89] This letter was apparently filed away and not answered for months.[90] The long delay worried Murdoch.

> What about our Office? I do not like to bother you—but the time at which my resignation was to take place is approaching and neither Walcott or I would like to go away till some thing is settled —and unless he gets away at once he will have no leave at all— It has occurred to me that as the matter cannot now be got thro' the Treasury before August it might be convenient to you to put back a little the date of my resignation—I should not object though of course I do not wish it—but those under sentence of execution with me would no doubt be glad as in one case, Makeham's, it would I understand complete another year of service— I only throw this out in case it would be a matter of convenience to you.

This offer was at once accepted by the Colonial Office.[91]

Nothing further was done, however, until the end of November; then Murdoch's letter was ferreted out and considered again. In a talk with one of the Colonial Office officials the Commissioner agreed that "we" could not urge on the Treas-

[89]Murdoch to W. R. Malcolm, 29 May 1876. C.O. 384/112. Alfred received £480, Makeham £435, Pownall £345, and Gill £220.

[90]Minutes on the letter state,—answered 5 December 1876; copy to Treasury, 11 Dec.; further to Emigration Office, 17 February 1877.

[91]Note from Murdoch to Meade, 23 June 1876. *Ibid.* Minuted: "I have told Sir C. Murdoch that to allow time for consideration the period for retirement had better be considered as not sooner than the end of the Sept. [?] quarter. R. M.[eade] 23/6."

ury the continued employment of Engelbach who was physically infirm (eyes), but he could remain until the end of the financial year (31 March 1877). It was further agreed that the best arrangement for disposing of the financial business of the Board would be to transfer the bulk of it to the Crown Agents. For the future Walcott would receive Murdoch's salary of £1200; some extra copying assistance might be needed from time to time, but the reduced establishment would cost £2188 as against £4517 for the year previous. A reduction of not less than £1800 had been promised. Lord Carnarvon decided to retain in some shape two Commissioners so as to keep up a Board, and until Walcott's retirement Bramston, the Junior Assistant Under-Secretary, was designated as second Commissioner with an increase of his salary from £1000 to £1200. After the end of the year the financial clerk of the Colonial Office would pay the salaries for the Board. The whole scheme for reduction was then referred back to Murdoch for final consideration.[92] At the same time the Colonial Office communicated to the Treasury all the correspondence upon the subject. The Emigration staff which now numbered ten (two Commissioners, chief clerk, three first-class clerks, one second-class clerk, messenger, writer, and porter) was to be reduced to five (one Commissioner, two first-class clerks, messenger and porter). The expense of the reduced establishment showed a reduction of almost 50 per cent. (£2425):[93]

	1876-7	Proposed (1877-8)
Salaries	£4517	£2192
Incidentals	100	100
Passages of convicts' families, etc.	300	200
	£4917	£2492

[92]R.M. to Herbert, 28 November 1876; C.O. to Commrs., 5 December. C.O. 384/112; C.O. 485/1.

[93]C.O. to Treasury, 11 December 1876. *Ibid.* Those to be reduced were Murdoch, Engelbach, Alfred, Makeham and the writer. Two months later,

In accordance with the request of the Colonial Office Murdoch described in detail the financial business of the Commissioners which was to be transferred, for the most part, to the Crown Agents. He suggested that the latter should in future handle guano and other license moneys, the commutation money of pensioners from the dockyards and arsenals, the payment of embarkation orders issued by the Natal emigration agent, the receipt of deposit money for emigration to the Falkland Islands, the payment of the passage of other emigrants sent out on authority of the Emigration Board, and finally the purchase of coolie clothing and hire of surgeons for the coolie trade. These transfers, Murdoch recommended, should be made by 31 December 1876.[94] The Colonial Office gave its approval to these suggestions, and directed that the necessary arrangements be immediately completed.[95] The Admiralty Lords, however, pointed out that few pensioners from the dockyards now availed themselves of the opportunity to emigrate, and at their suggestion the Treasury abrogated the regulations.[96] With this exception the various financial duties of the Emigration Board were surrendered at the end of the year.

To the Crown Agents Walcott wrote that "in consequence of the reorganization of this Establishment Lord Carnarvon has been pleased to direct that the financial business connected with the Colonies hitherto performed by this Board shall be trans-

after Murdoch had gone, the C.O. wrote Walcott that "the future position of the Emigration Office is not yet definitely settled"; the Treasury, however, had agreed to the estimate for 1877-8, and his salary was to be £1200 from January 1. Gill was to be promoted from the second to the first class from the same date. C.O. to Walcott, 17 February 1877. C.O. 384/112.

[94]Murdoch to Herbert, 9 December 1876. *Ibid.* For details *vide infra.* Murdoch took the occasion to pay high tribute to Engelbach.

[95]C.O. to Treasury and Commrs., 30 December. C.O. 384/112; C.O. 485/1. A week later (8 January 1877) the C.O. sent to the Crown Agents copies of the correspondence relating to the transfer of business. *Ibid.*

[96]Walcott to Herbert, 3 January 1877; C.O. to Treasury, 6 January; Admiralty to C.O., 17 February; Treasury to C.O., 22 June. C.O. 384/116.

ferred to your Department." The balances of sums received for colonial services would therefore be handed over to them.[97] Some time later a circular was dispatched to the governors of the various colonies concerned—Victoria, Western Australia, Natal, Mauritius, Jamaica, British Guiana, Trinidad, Grenada, Nevis, St. Vincent, and the Falkland Islands—and to certain commercial companies informing them that in consequence of the reduction in the establishment, the financial business of the Emigration Board had been transferred to the Crown Agents for the Colonies. This applied, however, only to the receipt and payment of money; in other respects the Board would continue to perform the same functions as before.[98]

In the meantime certain other arrangements had been completed. Technicalities required another "accounting officer" to take Murdoch's place in rendering accounts, signing cheques and orders, etc., as such documents had to bear two signatures. It was therefore decided that Walcott was to be chairman and hence *ex officio* accounting officer. Bramston, as had been suggested some time earlier, was to be the second Commissioner and would supply the other signature needed for the documents.[99] By January 1, 1877 Murdoch and three of the staff had retired, and arrangements were practically complete for the transfer of all the financial business of the Board to other hands.[100] Walcott, Bramston and a skeleton staff of five survived to perform what few functions still remained. Three

[97]Walcott to Crown Agents, 2/3 January 1877. C.O. 386/2. A letter from the C.O. to the Treasury, 31 May, requested the transfer of the balance in the account of the Commrs. at the Bank of England to the account of the Agents. C.O. 485/1.

[98]Circular, 31 March 1877. C.O. 386/2.

[99]Walcott to Herbert, 29 December 1876; minute by R. Ebden, 30 December; letter to Treasury, 4 January 1877. C.O. 384/112; C.O. 485/1.

[100]Murdoch was awarded £1200 (or full) pension, Alfred £320 and Makeham £300 annually from 1 January 1877. Treasury to Herbert, 8 February 1877. C.O. 384/116. Alfred sent his "best thanks" for the pension; Makeham had hoped for more, but sent his thanks to his many chiefs —Elliot, Lefevre, Blachford, Wood and Murdoch. C.O. 386/2. Engelbach, who retired on 31 March 1877, received a pension of £400 from that date.

months later Engelbach, the assistant secretary and accountant, also retired, in accordance with the arrangements made.

At the end of that year (1877) Commissioner Walcott submitted the usual estimate for the Colonial Land and Emigration Board. It was the same as for the previous year except for the usual salary increases for Pownall and Gill, the two clerks.

	1877-8	1878-9	Increase
Salaries and wages	£2192	£2230	£38
Incidentals	100	100	
Passages of convicts' families, etc.	200	200	
	£2492	£2530	£38

Although Carnarvon, the Colonial Secretary, approved the estimate, the Treasury Lords did not; incidentals were reduced to £50 and passages to £150. To these decreases Walcott had no remarks to make or objections to offer.[101] But this estimate for the financial year 1 April 1878—31 March 1879 was not destined to become effective, for on 31 March 1878 the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission was abolished. Six weeks earlier (12 February 1878) Walcott penned these lines to Under-Secretary Herbert: "As I understand that the Secretary of State and the Treasury think it advisable in the public interest that the Emigration Office should be abolished, and as I should be unwilling to stand in the way of any arrangement having that object in view, I beg to submit to the Secretary of State my resignation as Chairman of the Emigration Board to take effect from the 31st of next month."[102] Ebden,

[101]The salaries were divided: chairman £1200, two first-class clerks £698, messenger £77, porter £55, and copying £200. Walcott to Herbert, 19 November 1877; Treasury to C.O., 6 December. C.O. 384/116.

[102]Walcott to Herbert, 12 February 1878. C.O. 384/121. Walcott stated his age as 71; he had been 38 years in the service. In 1832 he had been appointed as assistant commissioner for enquiry into the operation of the Poor Laws in England and Wales; in 1835 appointed civil or chief secretary in Canada; 18 March 1840 appointed secretary to the Emigration Commission, and 21 July 1860 Commissioner.

one of the Colonial Office staff, suggested that the letter be forwarded to the Treasury with a recommendation for the highest possible pension, and that a complimentary letter be sent to Walcott. Meade, an Assistant Under-Secretary, added his work of praise: "A long course of able service unostentatiously rendered in a Department which has of late lost its importance only because its work has been accomplished." Meade added that Lord Carnarvon before he resigned office had settled the details of the final dissolution of the Board and the changes in the Colonial Office consequent thereon; all that remained was to give effect to those arrangements. The remaining clerks on the Emigration staff were to be absorbed into the Colonial Office, where they would be expected to make themselves generally useful. Ebden would continue to take charge of emigration work and was to receive an additional £100 as assigned to the principal or first-class clerk charged with these duties.[103]

On March 4, 1878 the final steps were officially taken by the dispatch of a series of letters from the Colonial Office. The first, to the Treasury, recommended Walcott for the highest rate of pension, as Ebden had suggested. A second, from Herbert to Walcott, informed him of this, accepted his resignation and added:

I am to take this opportunity to express to you the high regard in which your services have been held by successive Secretaries of State. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach is confident that his immediate predecessor would have directed his appreciation of those services to be conveyed to you with all the emphasis due to a personal acquaintance with them commencing as far back as twenty years, and I am to state that although his own connection with the Colonial Office is only very recent yet Sir Michael Hicks-Beach is well aware of their great value and that they have been rendered with untiring zeal and often in circumstances of unusual difficulty and pressure.[104]

[103]*Ibid.* These minutes by R.M., dated 22 February, were also initialled by R.G.W.H. (Herbert), and M.E.H.-B. (Hicks-Beach, the new Colonial Secretary).

[104]Hicks-Beach had succeeded Carnarvan as Colonial Secretary but one month previously (February 4). Walcott was granted a pension of £800 dating from April 1. Entry of letter, 15 March 1878, in C.O. 485/1.

A third letter, also to Walcott, concerned the transfer of his clerks to the Colonial Office. Two other letters related to the final transfer of business to the Crown Agents. Walcott was requested to arrange with these officers for the transfer to their department of the remaining business connected with coolie and other shipping arrangements. The Crown Agents were at the same time informed of this; general emigration correspondence would be handled by the Colonial Office, but the Agents were to take over the other duties mentioned. It was not apprehended that this business would entail much additional labor on their department.[105] Specifically these duties were (1) the conduct of coolie emigration from India to the West Indies; (2) the arrangement of passages for convicts' families to Tasmania and Western Australia; (3) the granting of land orders for the Falkland Islands and providing, out of the purchase money, passages for emigrants nominated by the purchasers; (4) the management of the Natal emigration.[106]

Nothing now remained but the farewells. To R. W. S. Mitchell, Government Emigration Agent for Trinidad, Walcott paid his adieux on March 22, expressing his appreciation of the cordial relations which had always existed between them, and of the hearty co-operation he had received from the Agent in carrying out their common duties. Mitchell courteously returned the compliments.[107] A few days later Walcott wrote to the Comptroller and Auditor General informing him that "in consequence of my retirement from the Public Service on the 31st instant and to the non-appointment of any successor to my office, this Board will cease to exist as a separate department at the close of the present financial year . . . "[108] Under-Secretary Herbert was then informed that the proper

[105]These five letters will be found in C.O. 384/121; entries in C.O. 485/1.

[106]Walcott to Crown Agents, 30 March 1878. C.O. 384/121. Details were given concerning each of the four duties.

[107]C.O. 384/120.

[108]Draft letter, 27 March, in C.O. 386/2.

arrangements had been made and the proper persons notified.[109] The next day, March 31, 1878, Commissioner Stephen Walcott laid down his pen and Her Majesty's Colonial Land and Emigration Commission had ceased to exist.

[109]Walcott to Herbert, 30 March 1878. Some C.O. minutes on this letter concerned the Commissioners' seal; it was to be recalled. C.O. 384/121. Walcott's last minute in his line of duty seems to have been that on a West Indian dispatch, giving his approval to a Grenada ordinance, 27 March 1878. C.O. 384/118.

IV

DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION

"IT will be your duty to diffuse, either by oral or by written statements, a distinct and compendious account of whatever relates to the agriculture, the commerce, the natural products, the physical structure, and the ecclesiastical and political institutions of each of the colonies in which you may offer lands for sale." Although Lord Russell surrounded this instruction with so many qualifications and provisos as to make it appear almost impracticable, it did not deter the Emigration Commissioners from doing some very valuable work; nor did they confine their attention solely to the colonies in which they offered lands for sale. Their work in carrying out this instruction falls into four fields: special publications, the Colonization Circulars, the General Reports, and cautionary and miscellaneous notices. Each of these will be treated separately.

At their second Board meeting, 22 January 1840, Elliot, Torrens and Villiers "agreed to prepare a circular re Colonies to which emigrants go."[1] This decision apparently was not immediately carried out. But later in the year when the Governor-General of Canada proposed that the Commissioners frame a series of questions upon "those points on which Persons intending to emigrate generally desire information,"[2] the suggestion was at once adopted and two sets of questions were prepared (28 July).

In the one set we applied for information upon every point connected with the facilities which were afforded in effecting a settlement upon the waste lands, the expense attending the clearance of them and the profits likely to arise from their cultivation. In the other set we inquired as to the assistance rendered to the poorer class of emigrants in proceeding into the interior of the country, the rate of wages, the cost of necessaries, and the general

[1]C.O. 386/140.

[2]Thomson's dispatch of 17 April; see G. 48, pp. 125-126.

expense of living; together with such other questions bearing upon the interests of both classes as we thought likely to elicit useful information. . . .[3]

After several months the replies to the questionnaire began to come in. From the data received the Commissioners, early in 1842, prepared a little pamphlet "for the use of persons disposed to emigrate to British North America"; they believed this would furnish the public "with a body of information more complete than any which . . . had before been communicated from authentic sources." The first edition of the pamphlet, published at Charles Knight's at a very low rate, was rapidly sold and a second edition was soon issued.[4] The table of contents illustrates the scope of the pamphlet: functions of the Commissioners; list of Government Emigration Agents; average length of passages to Quebec in 1841; price of conveyance; table of distances; area, population, climate and coinage of the provinces; number of emigrants in past years; information for emigrants with capital; information for emigrants of the laboring class; caution to emigrants against refusing offer of good wages; caution against re-emigrating from the British colonies into the adjoining states.

In 1843 the North American pamphlet was still on sale, and a third revised edition was being prepared;[5] one upon the Falkland Islands had also been issued.[6] From time to time other special pamphlets of this nature were published, as for

[3]Report 1842, p. 3. The first set of questions (28 in number) was for emigrants with capital, the second set (37) for those from the laboring class. Questionnaires were sent throughout all the British North American colonies.

[4]*Ibid.* See also C.O. 384/61; G. 48 and 112. Copies of the pamphlet were sent out to the various governors asking that the statements concerning their provinces be carefully examined by competent persons, errors corrected, and any further information supplied. Only one minor error was found. G. 112, pp. 255-256. New Brunswick printed her answers in a separate hand-book in 1841.

[5]G. 118, pp. 130-134.

[6]Report 1843, p. 45.

instance two in 1863—"Information respecting Free and Assisted Passages to the Colonies" and its companion "Information for Emigrants proceeding in Ships dispatched by the Emigration Commissioners."[7]

These publications, however, were but preliminary, or supplementary, to the great organ of information issued by the Emigration Board. In their report presented in 1843 the Commissioners remarked: "We have issued, by way of experiment, two numbers of a new publication called 'The Colonization Circular,' each consisting of a single sheet, and easily transmissible by post." This pamphlet, they hoped, would fulfil the first duty specified in their instructions.

> If we succeed in getting together and producing those facts which a party going to the colonies, or helping others to go there, would be most anxious to possess, we trust that our function may be considered as discharged, and that it will not be deemed a just ground of complaint against us, if persons altogether unconcerned in the subject do not receive or read these publications.[8]

The experiment was a success; between 1843 and 1877 there appeared thirty-four numbers of the "Colonization Circular Issued by Her Majesty's Colonial Land and Emigration Commissoners."[9] At first the Circular was a modest little pamphlet of sixteen pages (Nos. 1—6); then it began to grow slowly; the issue for 1857 contained fifty-three pages, that for 1862 had reached one hundred. Year by year the growth continued until No. 32 (1873) numbered two hundred and ten pages. The price of the Circular was always kept remarkably low. Originally it sold for four pence (Nos. 1—4), but was soon reduced to two pence (Nos. 5—11); then the increasing size of the publication raised the price to three pence (Nos. 12—15), and finally to six pence (Nos. 19—32).[10] Thus this

[7]See P.P. ♯430 (1863). These related primarily to the Australian colonies. Revised numbers were issued in May 1866. Report 26, App. 44.

[8]Report 1843, p. 46.

[9]The first issue was dated 13 May 1843; two more appeared the same year. For a full list with dates see Appendix 4.

[10]Nos. 16-18 (1856-8) were sold at two pence again.

valuable little mine of statistics and information was always available to the poorest would-be emigrant. " . . . Annually renewed up to the latest dates—and collected from various quarters of the globe, [strangers and poor people] now have the desired information offered to them *on the responsibility of a department of Government.*"[11]

The purpose of the publication was set forth in the first issue:

> With the view of meeting the increasing demand for information on questions affecting the interests of persons intending to settle in the British colonies, the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners have decided to issue in a convenient and unexpensive form, printed notices, on all matters connected with Colonization. They will thus be enabled to submit to the public, with but little delay, all the authentic information which is received from the different colonies respecting the amount of land which may be ready for settlement, the opening out of new districts, the extent of previous land sales, the demand for labour, and the rates of wages, with the prices of provisions, dwellings, etc.
>
> These notices will appear in numbers not at stated periods, but from time to time as the Commissioners may deem the information in their possession of sufficient interest or importance to deserve publication.[12]

The policy indicated in the second paragraph was followed for the first three issues. Each Circular dealt with different topics. The first one, for example, contained information on the North American and Australasian colonies—their emigration agents, tax on emigrants, mode of land sale, wages, prices, population statistics, length and cost of voyages, and finally emigration returns. The next one was somewhat different. Half of its contents referred to Poor Law emigration, length of voyages to Canada and New Brunswick, the demand for labor and volume of immigration in those colonies, exports and imports and crimes of South Australia, and land claims in

[11]Report 7, p. 6. The italics are mine. No data are available as to the sales of the Circular; one issue went through at least nine editions (No. 8 in 1848) and others through two (Nos. 9, 11, 12).

[12]Col. Circ. 1, p. 1.

New Zealand. The remainder of the Circular related to New South Wales—demand for labor, bounty emigration, progress of the colony, and a map. Again there was a change of content for the third issue. One special section dealt with the emigration of Chinese and African laborers to Mauritius and the West Indies; other sections gave the land regulations and prices at the Cape of Good Hope, wages and prices in New Zealand, the general state of South Australia, and the rules for New South Wales bounty emigration. All three of these Circulars were published between May and November 1843, and may, indeed, properly be regarded as constituting one complete number.

With Circular No. 4, in 1844, a new policy was inaugurated. The reason for the change was stated by the Commissioners in their fourth Report:

> In deference to an opinion which we had seen expressed that it would be desirable to offer more frequent official intelligence connected with emigration, we made the experiment of producing the small publication styled the Colonization Circular; but although three numbers have been brought out, and have been extensively advertised, we have to state that the demand has been exceedingly trifling. Our belief from experience is, that it will be preferable for the future, to bring out a sheet annually at the commencement of the emigrant season, and to embody in it, for the use of the humbler classes, or those by whom they are assisted, the most recent information as to wages and prices in the different colonies, the rates of passage, and also as to the demand for labour, if on that point there should be any late and definite reports from the respective Governors.[13]

From this time on there appeared early each year a Circular containing the latest information concerning all the colonies and emigration in general.

Circular No. 4 was the model for all subsequent issues until 1858, and its table of contents may be given as typical. First came the list of Government Emigration Agents with a state-

[13] *Op. cit.*, pp. 37-38. The dates of publication of the Circulars after 1844 vary between February (1849) and May (1844, 1858, 1859); sometimes second editions were published later in the year.

ment of their duties. Then followed three sections on demand for labor, prices and wages in the North American and Australasian colonies. A fourth section set forth the disposal of Crown lands in these and other colonies; another gave the expenses of clearing land. Finally there was a group of miscellaneous hints, notices and statistics. In subsequent issues new items were added from time to time, such as—privileges to military and naval settlers (No. 5); victualling scale for African ships, warning not to proceed to River Plate (No. 6); rules for remitting money for assistance of emigrants, regulations on board North American and Australian ships, caution regarding Texas (No. 7); abstract of Passenger Acts (No. 8);[14] cost of passage to various colonies, amount of land disposed of and remaining, pasturage and timber licences in New Zealand, gold fields in New South Wales and Victoria (No. 12); governors of colonies and salaries (No. 15).

The eighteenth number, issued in 1858, rearranged the material in nine divisions—Emigration (subdivided into fifteen parts: agents, chaplains, passage rates, advice, bounties, etc., etc.); Hints to Emigrants to Australia; Hints to Emigrants to British America; Demand for Labor; Prices; Wages; Miscellaneous; Disposal of Crown Lands (with regulations for land, minerals, etc., in Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, British Guiana and Trinidad); Climate. This arrangement was followed for the next eleven issues, with the addition of a new section on Emigration Laws, and another on Pasture and Timber Licenses (No. 20 of 1861).[15]

The thirtieth issue of 1871 came out in a new format,[16]

[14]This item became a regular feature after this date (1848). In 1849 a second edition of No. 9 was brought out to give the latest data upon the new Act.

[15]In 1860 there was no issue of the Circular; that of 1861, by mistake, bears the number 21.

[16]The section on laws relating to land disposal occupied the most space, about 80 pages out of 173. Some new features were added: summaries of laws relating to professional qualifications in the colonies, and naturalization of aliens.

which was changed again in the second issue following (No. 32).[17] So much material was now published and the handbook had attained such a size that a division into chapters was convenient. The table of contents follows:

Cap. I.	Emigration Commissioners	2
	Emigration and Immigration Officers and Statistics	3
	Cost of Passages	5
	Assistance to Emigrate	6
Cap. II.	Demand for Labor in the Colonies	19
	Cost of Provisions and Clothing	22
	Wages, Prices, and Miscellaneous	25
	Population, Revenue, and Expenditure	31
Cap. III.	General Notices respecting certain Colonies	37
	General Notices, Warnings, South America	48
Cap. IV.	Coolie Emigration to the West Indies and Mauritius	51
Cap. V.	Summaries of Laws on Professional Qualifications	73
	" " " " Naturalization of Aliens	79
	" " " " Carriage of Passengers	87
	" " " " Disposal of Crown Lands	101
	" " " " Limitation of Rights	170
	Privileges in acquisition of Land to Naval and Military Officers	168
Cap. VI.	Gold Mining &c.	174
Cap. VII.	Climate	181
Index		198

In the later years of the Emigration Commission it was customary to print 1000 copies of the Circular, 600 of them for sale and the remaining 400 for transmission to the colonies and for the use of the Commissioners.[18] Early in 1876 the Colonial Office, in accordance with the usual practice, requested the Treasury to authorize the Comptroller of the Stationery Office to print the Colonization Circular for that year, but instead of the usual 1000 only 750 copies.[19] This was apparently done, but some difficulties presently arose. At the end of July Murdoch wrote to Herbert that the Circular was now in type, but the price was unsettled. The Comptroller of the Sta-

[17]The British Museum copy of this Circular is marked "No more received."

[18]See C.O. 384/100 and 101 for 1872 and 1873.

[19]C.O. to Treasury, 17 February 1876. C.O. 485/1.

tionery Office objected that 1/– was too low, and could not fix it at less than 8/3, which Murdoch believed was a prohibitory price. "Looking at the object of the publication which is not profit but the diffusion, in compliance with our general instructions, of knowledge of the colonies and of matters relating to emigration," the Commissioner asked that the Treasury be requested to authorize the 1/– price.[20] Carnarvon, the Colonial Secretary, agreed, but the Treasury would not sanction a price lower than 5/6 a copy, the actual cost of production. Even this amount Walcott regarded as prohibitory; the Treasury suggestion that the Circular be published in parts for colonies or groups of colonies, or else be reduced in size, would, he felt, defeat the object of the work.[21] Suggestions and counter-suggestions followed at intervals until finally, in November, a settlement was reached. Herbert spoke to the two Commissioners,[22] and it was agreed to continue the Circular in its 1874 form at 5/6, with a new edition to be issued when the old one was exhausted.[23] But after all this trouble it is not clear that the Circular was in the end actually printed; the thirty-fourth issue of 1875 is the last of which there is definite record.[24]

In addition to the Colonization Circular the Emigration Commissioners prepared each year a General Report. It was, as the title indicates, "a summary of the official proceedings" of the Board during the calendar year just completed, which

[20]C.O. 384/112. Minute by R. Ebden to Meade: " . . . Since the discontinuance of their annual Emigration Report in 1873, the E.C. have much enlarged the Colonization Circular." The issue for 1876, however, was smaller than that for the previous year.

[21]Treasury to C.O., 31 August 1876; minute by Walcott, 30 September. *Ibid.* Ebden remarked: "The Colonization Circular is a most useful work of reference and information"; to which Meade added: "a mine of wealth."

[22]" . . . To the latter of whom [Walcott] we are specially indebted for this excellent compilation . . . "

[23]Minute by Herbert, 18 November 1876. *Ibid.*

[24]See C.O. letter to Consul General of Uruguay, 5 November 1878. A letter to the Board of Trade, 18 December 1878, refers to a Circular for 1877; this is probably an error. C.O. 485/2.

was submitted to the Colonial Secretary and then, by command of Her Majesty, was presented to parliament, printed and circulated. But it was more than a mere report; it was "for purposes of reference, *the only periodical record which has ever been kept, collecting into one view the public transactions of all the colonies on two important branches of administration.*"[25] The General Report, in brief, is a complete survey of emigration, immigration, land sales and land policy within the British Empire, using each of those terms in its broadest sense. Labor conditions, wages, prices, imports, exports, revenue, legislation, exploration, mineral resources, transportation, any of a score of different topics related in any way to lands or emigration in the various colonies, are to be found in the annual publications. Not only are the Reports invaluable for a study of the work of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission, but for an economic and social survey of the British Empire in the years 1840 to 1873 they are equally useful.

Lord John Russell had instructed the Commissioners to report on their proceedings twice each year, but with the exception of the first Report this instruction was not carried out; instead an annual Report was presented in the spring of each year. There are thirty-three Reports in all, covering the years 1840 to 1872 inclusive. When part of the business of the Emigration Office was transferred to the Board of Trade, on January 1, 1873, the annual Report was discontinued as a separate work, and the Colonization Circular for the following year was somewhat enlarged to include part of the material formerly printed in the Report.[26] Like the Circular the Report tended to grow steadily in size. The first one was a modest folio of five pages, the next expanded to twenty-one, the third

[25]Report 7, pp. 6-8. The italics are mine. The Reports were primarily intended to fulfill the fourth of the Commissioners' duties—periodical reports—but they are of equal importance to their first duty.

[26]Minute by R. Ebden, 6 October 1876, on Treasury letter of 31 August. C.O. 384/112. The Report usually sold at 1/-, and the Circular at 2d. to 6d.; the combined publication sold at the same price as the Report (1/-).

to sixty-two; for the next eight issues the number of pages varied between sixty and one hundred and eighteen. After 1851 the folio edition was replaced by an octavo one; this ranged from ninety-four pages (1868) to three hundred and fifty-four (1865); the average was over two hundred pages.[27] The Report proper remained fairly stable in size, seldom less than forty pages (octavo), seldom more than sixty. The appendices, however, showed a decided tendency to increase in bulk, expanding from fifty pages to one hundred and seventy or even three hundred pages.

The first Report of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners, issued after six months' activities, was intended to give a "rapid sketch" of their proceedings. They enclosed a schedule of the reports which they had prepared for the Secretary of State, with a brief statement of the subject of each report; the list showed "no want of variety, or of magnitude, in the topics which have demanded attention in relation to colonial lands and to emigration."[28] The Report concluded with a brief consideration of each of the colonies which had figured in the proceedings of the Commission. Except for the schedule of reports, this brief five-page summary contained no statistics or appendices.[29]

Two years passed before the next Report was presented; then, apparently at Secretary Stanley's suggestion,[30] one was prepared and presented, 30 July 1842. This second Report gave a longer summary, divided into "Diffusion of Information," "Sale of Lands" (the bulk of the Report), and "Emigration" considered by colonies. Statistics, soon to become a

[27]A complete list will be found in Appendix 3. For the years 1843 to 1851 both folio and octavo editions were printed.

[28]Report 1840, p. 1.

[29]The original, dated 6 August 1840, is minuted by Stephen: "It certainly shows that they have been very actively employed." It is noteworthy that Torrens' signature has been struck out; the published report bears only the names of Elliot and Villiers. C.O. 384/62.

[30]See *Hansard,* LXVIII. 154-155. The original Report is in C.O. 384/73.

feature of the Reports, filled but two-thirds of a page in this early one.

Early in the next session of parliament Lord Stanley, in reply to a query if another Report was to be laid on the Table, promised that the next one would be ready shortly before the Easter recess.[31] The third Report, nevertheless, was not presented until 23 August 1843. It had now become quite a respectable pamphlet, numbering sixty-two pages in the folio edition printed for parliament, and eighty-five pages in the octavo put on sale at one shilling. By way of introduction the Commissioners wrote:

> In the communications which we are daily making to your Lordship's department, it is our duty to enter so fully into the reasons of the opinions we submit on any general questions referred to us, and so constantly to state with any necessary explanations our measures on subjects of practical administration, such as the conduct and superintendence of emigration by public aid, or the enforcement of the Passengers' Act, that little can remain for us to offer in the nature of a fresh report of proceedings. Our endeavour must rather be to render a periodical summary of the present kind useful as a review of the leading events connected with the subjects to which our duties relate. For the future, it is proposed to endeavour to present our annual report immediately after the Easter recess, before which period there is not time for the most important documents of the previous year to arrive from the colonies.[32]

In the body of the Report each colony was considered individually under the two heads lands and immigration; a second section dealt with the Passengers' Act; in another the West Indies and Mauritius received special treatment; and in conclusion a few words were said upon the diffusion of information. The appendices had now grown to sixteen in number, occupying about one-half the total space.

In accordance with the new policy announced in 1843 the Commissioners presented their fourth Report on April 2, 1844 (Easter time). As this was the first occasion for adopting this

[31]March 30, 1843. *Hansard,* LXVIII. 154-155.

[32]Report 1843, p. 1.

course, and because of the comparatively short period which had elapsed since the previous Report, the quantity of new matter was necessarily somewhat curtailed.[33] The usual arrangement was followed in the Report: discussion of the Australasian and North American colonies as to lands and immigration, remarks upon the West Indian, Mauritius and other colonies, diffusion of information and appendices. From this year on the Reports appeared regularly between March 20 (1845) and May 21 (1859);[34] the majority of them were presented at the end of April. From time to time the make-up of the Report was rearranged. Beginning with the seventh Report (1847)[35] the table of contents ran: Preliminary Remarks; Diffusion of Information; Total Emigration from the United Kingdom; Australasian, North American Colonies; Passenger Act; Immigration into Mauritius, into the West Indies; Land in the West Indies; Other Colonies, and Miscellaneous. With the exception of the section on the diffusion of information, which did not again appear, this was the form followed in general by all subsequent Reports.

What was a typical Report like? It opened with preliminary remarks, giving the total emigration for the past year, analyzing it as to destination, national origin of emigrants (English, Scotch, Irish or foreign), comparing it in each of these respects with the emigration of the previous year or years, and finally pointing out any noteworthy features of that year's exodus. Then the Commissioners considered in detail the assisted or "government" emigration of the year, and passed from that to comments upon the operation of the Passengers Act. Another field of their work was touched on in the section dealing with the migration of Indians to Mauritius,

[33]Report 1844, p. 1.

[34]Because of extraordinary circumstances, the absence of Murdoch in North America on public service, Report 30 was delayed beyond the usual time and did not appear until 25 June 1870.

[35]It might be pointed out that the Commissioners began numbering their Reports in 1845—Fifth General Report.

and of Indians, Africans, and Chinese to the West Indies. In addition to these points each of these colonies was treated separately concerning colonial legislation, labor situation and other economic conditions. The Australasian colonies were next discussed individually on many economic points; then the North American colonies, the Cape of Good Hope, Natal, and any other colony concerning which there was something to report. In conclusion it was customary to briefly refer to the emigration prospects for the year then beginning. After the Report proper came the appendices. The first fifteen or twenty of these were statistical, analyzing the emigration under many different heads: destination, nationality, occupation, age, sex, port of sailing, mortality. The government emigration to the Australasian and West Indian colonies, Mauritius and the Cape was also minutely analyzed. These statistical tables were followed by papers arranged according to colony, giving in full important acts, ordinances, reports, correspondence, etc.—any official information which might be of use to emigrants of any class proceeding to the colonies. Land legislation formed the bulk of these documents, with West Indian immigration legislation another important item. The value of both Reports and appendices for economic and social material on British imperial history cannot be too often stressed.

Another form of information service performed by the Emigration Commissioners deserves special notice. This was the issue, from time to time as necessary, of cautions concerning futile schemes of foreign colonization. The first of these appeared in 1846 in the Colonization Circular of that year: "Emigrants are warned that in the present state of affairs, it is highly unadvisable that they should proceed to the River Plate."[36] In the following year Texas drew unfavorable mention; the statements circulated about the salubrious climate,

[36]Col. Circ. 6, p. 16; repeated in Col. Circ. 7, p. 22. Report 6, pp. 57f, referred to this notice and expressed the hope that it would check the emigration to that district. See also Report 7, p. 8.

fertile soil, and mineral wealth of this newly acquired state of the Union, were declared to be greatly exaggerated; on the contrary, British subjects emigrating there were "likely to fall into sickness and destitution."[37]

With the one exception of Texas, however, all unfavorable mention was confined to South American lands and colonization projects. Another district condemned about the same time as the River Plate was "Equador." Toward the end of September 1846 the Commissioners heard that an unsigned placard had been posted about the city of Limerick inviting persons to emigrate to that republic. The suspicions of the Board being aroused, Emigration Agent Lynch was directed to make inquiry. The result was unsatisfactory and the Commissioners "caused him without loss of time to issue [a] handbill." All concerned were warned "that the Situation and Climate of Equador are of very doubtful fitness for Europeans. That Emigrants will find themselves under a distant and foreign Government, with no protection from home, and that the alleged free Emigration is in no respect known to, or approved by the Government of this Country. Young Men are particularly warned against being misled into enlistment for Soldiers in Equador."[38] A counter-placard containing some vague statements, and signed by William Ogilvie, Bart., was then posted. Lynch, on investigation, found the greatest reluctance in giving answers to his inquiries; the magistrates of Limerick also investigated the emigration proposals and condemned them. The Emigration Commissioners hoped that these steps would suffice to "quite defeat" the plans of Ogilvie and his associates.[39]

The great period of South American colonization schemes was between the years 1869 and 1875, a period during which

[37]Col. Circ. 7, p. 22.

[38]Placard, "by order of Her Majesty's Emigration Commissioners," dated 7 October 1846 and printed in Limerick. C.O. 384/77.

[39]Commrs. to Stephen, 29 October 1846. *Ibid.* Grey approved the steps taken.

Venezuela, the Argentine, Brazil and Paraguay were attracting settlers. Time after time the Emigration Board found it necessary to issue warning notices. In 1869 the agent of a Dr. Prices's Company had sent to Venezuela some settlers who soon were in a state of destitution. Capt. Foster, the emigration officer at London, investigated the plans at the time (August 1869) but found that no laws had been infringed by the agent. As regards the past then nothing could be done, but a cautionary notice warning against Venezuela or the north coast of South America was proposed to deter future emigration. This seems to have sufficed as Venezuela does not appear again.[40]

A few years later it was the turn of Paraguay. The British consul there advised against the proposals advanced by Messrs. Robinson Fleming & Co. Walcott was thereupon instructed to draw up a cautionary notice, stating that Her Majesty's government could not recommend persons of the laboring class to emigrate to Paraguay. The country had been very unsettled since the end of the war in 1870, the climate was very unsuitable, and emigrants to that republic or to the neighboring South American states would have to contend with far greater difficulties than were to be encountered in the British colonies.[41]

The worst offenders, however, were connected with the Argentine and Brazil. At the close of 1869 complaints about settlements in southern Argentina began to reach the Board, but they decided that there was not as yet sufficient cause to issue a notice on the matter. Furthermore such action would offend the Argentine government which heretofore had acted with great liberality towards British emigrants.[42] A few days

[40]Murdoch to Rogers, 26 January 1870. C.O. 386/119, pp. 9-11.

[41]Walcott to Meade, 7 October 1872. *Ibid.*, pp. 272-275, 281. Report 33, Appendix 22. Another notice drawn up later (24 December) was noted by Murdoch as "pretty strong," so an amended notice was framed and issued (February 1873). C.O. 386/119, pp. 308-310, 319-321. Report 33, Appendix 22.

[42]Commrs. to Rogers, 27 January 1870. C.O. 386/119, pp. 12-14.

later, however, the receipt of further information from Buenos Ayres satisfied the Foreign Office that a notice ought to be issued. The Board thereupon drew up a draft referring to the fact that several murders had been committed, and that "no effectual steps have been taken by the local government either to bring the murderers to justice or to protect the survivors." Emigrants were warned that under these circumstances there appeared to be no sufficient security for life in the Argentine Republic.[43] Copies of the notice were printed and circulated, but some weeks later the Colonial Office, in consequence of a strong remonstrance from several gentlemen connected with Buenos Ayres, instructed the Commissioners to discontinue the warning.[44]

A year later a caution was necessary concerning the Henly settlement at Rosario. The British chargé d' affaires at Buenos reported the "utter failure" of the colony, whereupon at the suggestion of Lord Granville, the Foreign Secretary, the Commissioners drew up a memo to be inserted in the *Times* and other newspapers.[45] In the following year yet another colonization scheme in the Argentine was condemned by the Board. Emigrants intending to proceed to the Welsh settlement on the Chupat River in Patagonia[46] were warned that they would almost certainly "expose themselves to disappointment, privation and loss."[47] At the end of June (1872) Mur-

[43]Murdoch to Rogers, 2 February 1870. *Ibid.*, pp. 16-18, 30.

[44]April 6, 1870. *Ibid.*, pp. 48, 61.

[45]Sixty young Englishmen of good family had subscribed £150 each. A clergyman and doctor went out with the settlers, but the young men were not suited to the work of farming and the colony was ere long abandoned. Henly, the promoter, disappeared, leaving the men "penniless in a distant land, ignorant of the language, unprotected and exposed to every possible danger." Murdoch to Holland, 5 January 1871. *Ibid.*, pp. 123-126.

[46]As early as the spring of 1867 the Commissioners had drawn attention to the fact that this settlement, begun in 1865, was not succeeding, but expressed hopes for improvement. Report 27, pp. 51-52.

[47]The first draft was drawn up in March 1872, with the suggestion that it be translated into Welsh, published and distributed. Murdoch to Holland, 15 March. C.O. 386/119, pp. 210ff. A revised notice was issued 29 July.

doch sent a draft notice for careful scrutiny by the Foreign Office, warning that disturbances in the Province of Corrientes imperilled the lives and property of settlers; there had also been Indian attacks and outrages at Bahia Blanca and Tandil.[48] Three months later yet another notice was issued concerning Indian uprisings in Rosario district.[49]

Brazil also proved to be unhealthy land for English settlers. The Consul-General of Brazil had invited emigrants from the United Kingdom to proceed thither, but reports from the British legation at Rio de Janiero strongly dissuaded emigrants "from risking health and independence for an inadequate remuneration in a trying climate among people of habits and ideas differing from their own." The Colonial Office at once directed the Commissioners to issue a notice (June 1872).[50] The matter came up for discussion in the Lords when the Earl of Carnarvon drew attention to a British emigration to Brazil and declared the country was quite undesirable. Earl Granville replied that "it had lately been the painful duty of the Foreign Office to furnish such information to the Emigration Commissioners as would enable them to warn intending emigrants of the fate likely to await them if they went to certain foreign countries." Some criticism had been made of this, but it was duty.[51]

That was not the end of Brazilian schemes; in 1875 another was banned. At the direction of the Secretary of State the Commissioners prepared a handbill to be posted in the post offices and outports and published in newspapers, warning emigrants against schemes for emigration from the United King-

Ibid., pp. 247-249. C.O. 384/112. A new notice was issued in February 1876, but later in the year more favorable reports were received.

[48]Murdoch to Herbert, 27 June 1872. C.O. 386/119, pp. 242ff.

[49]September-October 1872. *Ibid.*, pp. 266-268, 281. See Report 33, Appendix 22 for this and the preceding notices.

[50]C.O. to Commrs., 8 June. C.O. 485/1. Murdoch to Holland, 12 June. C.O. 386/119, pp. 235-242. The notice, dated July 1, is in Report 33, Appendix 22.

[51]February 17, 1873. *Hansard,* CCXIV. 532-536.

dom to Brazil and pointing out the unhappy results of 1872-3.[52] This notice seems to have been prompted by the colonization schemes of a Mr. Kitto; but he was not dissuaded, and in June of the following year the cautionary notice was reissued upon Lord Carnarvon's instructions.[53] Later in the year further complaints were received about the "Kittoland scheme" but Walcott could not see that there was anything else that could be done to prevent it. When another report was soon afterwards received from Rio telling of frauds and other mistreatment, a fresh notice was suggested, approved and issued.[54] Later, on the receipt of more favorable reports from Kittoland, a revised notice was drawn up and published.[55]

Canada also was concerned in Brazilian emigration. In 1876 the Foreign Office sent to the Colonial Office a report from the chargé at Rio concerning a proposed emigration from Canada and the United States. Murdoch believed that the only thing that could be done was "to suggest to the Canadian Government to put out a notice cautioning Emigrants against going either to Para or Pernambuco." His suggestion was approved and a dispatch drawn up directing Governor-General Dufferin to lay the matter before his government.[56]

It is difficult to appraise or estimate exactly the value of the work performed by the Emigration Commissioners through these cautionary notices; but that it was an important service to the emigrants from the United Kingdom there can be little doubt.

In numerous other ways information was diffused through the instrumentality of the Emigration Board. 1. Scores of

[52]"Caution to Emigrants," signed by R. B. Cooper, assistant secretary, 10 February 1875. C.O. 384/107.

[53]June 17, 1876. C.O. 485/1.

[54]November 1876. The notice was first approved by the C.O. and F.O. and then published in the *Times* and other papers. C.O. 384/112.

[55]January 1877. It had at first been proposed to suspend publication of the notice. C.O. 384/112 and 116.

[56]March 1876. C.O. 384/112. Further dispatches, framed in accordance with Murdoch's minutes, were sent to Dufferin 23 May and 2 June 1876.

parliamentary papers were prepared fully or in part by the Commissioners. In 1841, for example, there were three papers on New South Wales, one on general emigration correspondence, one on Canada, and another on Newfoundland; in 1842 a return of statistics was called for, followed by another on the Passengers' Bill.[57] In 1863 the Board was required to prepare "Returns for the Years 1860, 1861 and 1862, and the first Six Months of 1863, showing the Number of Emigrants who left the United Kingdom for the United States, British North America, the several Colonies of Australasia, South Africa, and other Places respectively; of Emigration for the Years 1815 to 1863 . . . " (P. P. #430 of 1863). Murdoch on one occasion pointed out that more than once practically the whole office had been engaged for months in the preparation of returns called for by parliament.

2. In conformity with directions we received from [the Colonial Secretary], it is our practice on receiving the periodical reports from the emigrant agents in North America, to give our officers in this country notice of any information connected with the vessels which have sailed from their stations, and they are desired to affix such information in some conspicuous place in their offices, and, if possible, to obtain its insertion in some of the local newspapers.[58]

The emigration agencies at the outports were, of course, the means of supplying an immeasurable amount of written, printed or oral information to prospective emigrants. For instance, the Commissioners in 1844 noted that they had diffused information concerning Canada through the agency of the emigration officers.[59]

3. From time to time, as occasion or need required, a special announcement was published by the Commissioners in the

[57]Report 1842, p. 4. Altogether in 1842 there were three House and two Command papers prepared by the Commissioners; in 1843 there were seven House and two Command. Report 1843, p. 45.

[58]Report 1843, p. 46. Regular annual and quarterly returns were received from the colonial agents. See Reports 1842, p. 3; 5, p. 41.

[59]Report 1844, p. 37.

official *Gazette* or the newspapers—as for example, the Orders in Council concerning the use of distilling apparatus on board ships.

4. One of the most important methods of diffusing information—since it was direct and to the point—was by the large volume of correspondence between the Board and private individuals in every part of the United Kingdom. "The amount of this correspondence has been steadily increasing since the formation of our office; and though the results from it are not capable of being produced in any tangible shape, it forms, of course, an essential part of our practical duties."[60]

5. In addition to the issue of cautionary notices, the Commissioners sometimes acted in another way as a board of censors. Governor-General Bagot once wrote to ask the Board if a pamphlet published in Canada by Rev. Mr. Abbot could advisably be circulated in England. The Commissioners objected to officially circulating publications for private persons, but were willing to co-operate in a measure approved by the provincial government. They offered to take two hundred copies of the pamphlet and circulate them with ones published by themselves; but the appendix concerning the Passengers Act must first be removed as it was inaccurate.[61]

The diffusion of accurate, up-to-date, and reliable information concerning the British colonies was certainly one of the most important of the many services performed by the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners, a service the importance of which it would be difficult to over-estimate. When the other duties of the Board were being transferred to various offices, this one was not specifically provided for. It could hardly be dispensed with for long, and the subject soon came up.

[60]Report 1842, p. 4.

[61]Correspondence 14 January-30 March 1843. G. 116, pp. 272-276. The Commissioners sent a corrected version of the appendix.

Diffusion of Information

The Emigration Commissioners have always been the advisers of H. M. Government, and the Department charged with taking action, on all matters connected with Emigration, not only to the Colonies but to any place. Now that the Emigration Board no longer exists as a separate Department it becomes a question what Department should issue such notices of warning to Emigrants as they have been in the practice of issuing. I have spoken to Mr. Meade and we think that the Board of Trade should be asked whether, now that the Emigration Board has been abolished and they are the Department supervising Emigration they will issue such notices as the Emigration Board used to issue. . . .[62]

This was only a partial solution to the problem, and the matter did not end there. In 1884 the Emigration Agent for Natal, who was in favor of state-aided emigration, brought up the idea of an "Emigrants' Information Office." The Home Office suggested to the Colonial Office the establishment of such a bureau (27 March 1885), and the matter was seriously considered. Finally, in 1886, the Emigrants' Information Office was established as a department of the Colonial Office, carrying on the important work once performed by the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners in supplying to prospective emigrants and others a great volume of valuable information concerning the colonies of the Empire.[63]

[62]Minute by Herbert, 6 October 1878, on a letter from the Foreign Office. C.O. 384/121.

[63]See P.P. ♯c.4751 (1886), especially p. 69.

V

REGULATION OF EMIGRANT TRAVEL— THE PASSENGERS ACTS

IN his instructions to the Commissioners Lord John Russell told them that, with respect to voluntary emigration, they were to exercise a general superintendence over the agents at the principal ports, and to consider revisions of the Passengers Acts. This latter instruction was soon expanded into a general supervision and administration of the working of the Acts, and became one of the most important of the duties performed by the Board. At the time the Commission was established conditions on board emigrant vessels were atrocious. Some legislative steps had been taken, it is true, to regulate the carriage of passengers by sea, but for years little attempt seems to have been made to compel observance of these laws. In June of 1803 parliament passed an act which, as far as it went, was very creditable.[1] Henceforth British vessels were not to carry more than one person, crew included, for every two tons burden. Passengers could be taken on board only at ports where there was a customs officer, and before clearing from port a muster roll was to be delivered to that official who was then, in company with a justice of the peace, to make a personal check of passengers and crew. Ships clearing for North American ports were required to carry a supply of provisions sufficient for twelve weeks, allowing each person a daily ration of one-half pound of meat, one and a third pounds of bread, one-half pint of "melasses" and one gallon of water. All ships with fifty or more persons on board were to carry a surgeon supplied with a medicine chest "properly stored." During the

[1] 43 Geo. III, c.56. "An Act for regulating the Vessels carrying Passengers from the United Kingdom to his Majesty's Plantations and Settlements abroad, or to Foreign Ports, with respect to the Number of such Passengers"; 24 June 1803. See Cowan, pp. 25-28.

voyage bedding was to be aired on deck once a day, weather permitting, and the ship fumigated with vinegar twice a week. Bond was to be given that the vessel was seaworthy and that the passengers would be duly landed at the specified ports. Master and surgeon were to keep a journal of the voyage and deliver the same to the Commissioners of Customs on their return to the United Kingdom. Enforcement of the act was entrusted to these Commissioners, while ships-of-war were empowered to stop and search vessels on the high seas.[2] But salutary as were the provisions of this law, little good seems to have resulted.

Some years later the act was amended with reference to British vessels carrying passengers to British North America.[3] For these ships the passenger ratio was now to be one adult to one and a half tons burden, three children under fourteen years of age counting as one adult. In addition to the list of passengers which was to be given to the customs officer on sailing, a second copy was now to be given to an official at the port of arrival. Supplies of food and water sufficient for twelve weeks were still required, but individual rations were changed to five pints of water, one pound of bread and one pound of beef (or three-quarters of a pound of pork) daily, and two pounds of flour, three pounds of oatmeal and one-half pound of butter weekly. An abstract of the act was to be posted in a conspicuous place on board ship.

In 1825 both these laws were repealed and a new one passed, to become effective in January 1826.[4] In general the provisions were much the same. The passenger ratio of one adult to two tons was retained (except for ships from Ireland to British North America), but ships carrying more than one person to five tons were now required to secure a license from the

[2]Government and East India Company vessels were exempted from the provisions of the act.

[3]57 Geo. III, c.10; 17 March 1817.

[4]6 Geo. IV, c.105; and c.116, "An Act for Regulating Vessels carrying Passengers to Foreign Ports," 5 July 1825.

Commissioners of Customs. Another innovation was the provision that all British passenger vessels were to be marked with a letter P in white. The new act was of but brief duration; less than two years later it was repealed, 28 May 1827,[5] and the following year a new measure took its place on the statute books. This act, quite brief in its provisions, applied only to vessels from the United Kingdom to "the Continent and Islands of North America."[6] The passenger ratio was fixed at three persons to four tons; decks must be five and a half feet apart. Sufficient provisions were to be carried on board to supply each passenger with fifty gallons of water and fifty pounds of bread. As usual copies of the muster list were to be deposited with the collector of customs at the ports of departure and arrival. Ship masters were to give bond of £1000 for the due performance of these regulations; violations of the act could now be prosecuted in the colonial courts.

In 1835 this law too was repealed. The new bill, introduced by W. E. Gladstone, passed with little opposition.[7] It was much broader in scope than the previous measure, and applied to all British vessels sailing to any port overseas.[8] The passenger ratio was reduced to three persons to five tons, and to this was added the further restriction that regardless of tonnage no more passengers were to be carried than one per ten "superficial feet" of the lower deck, or one to fifteen if the ship was to cross the equator. The space between decks was

[5]7&8 Geo. IV, c.19. It simply recites that "it is expedient to repeal the said act." Years later the Emigration Commissioners wrote that the law "was so stringent that it was considered needlessly to enhance the cost of conveyance, and became a subject of such general complaints that it was totally repealed." But the opposite kind of evils were at once felt and a new act was passed in the next session of parliament. Report 7, p. 33.

[6]9 Geo. IV, c.21; 23 May 1828. The Bahama and West Indian Islands were excepted from the act.

[7]5&6 Wm. IV, c.53; 31 August 1835. It was introduced by the Peel ministry in March, and passed under the new Melbourne administration. *Hansard,* XXVI. 1235-1239; XXVIII. 855-858; XXIX. 1151.

[8]An amendatory act, 1&2 Vict., c.113, sec. xxvi, extended the law to foreign vessels carrying emigrants from the United Kingdom.

left at five and a half feet, with the proviso that there should be no more than two tiers of berths. Food rations were again altered to five gallons of water and seven pounds of breadstuffs weekly per person; ships were required to carry a supply sufficient for the specified "minimum length of voyage" (ten weeks to North America, fifteen weeks to the Cape of Good Hope, etc.). Officers of the customs were to examine vessels before sailing to make sure that they were seaworthy and carried the proper supply of water and provisions. Doctors, originally required on all ships with fifty or more passengers, were now necessary only on those carrying one hundred or more;[9] smaller boats must carry a medicine supply. If a vessel delayed sailing beyond the specified date every passenger was to receive the sum of one shilling for each day's delay. Another section of the act placed severe restrictions on the carriage of liquor on board passenger vessels.

Meanwhile another important change was being made. At first the enforcement of these laws had been placed in the hands of the customs officers at the various ports. Those officials, however, had many other duties to attend to, and were unable to see to the proper enforcement of the passenger ship legislation. In 1833 the important step was taken of establishing in the principal ports a corps of emigration officers with the sole duty of supervising the working of these acts and the conduct of the emigrant trade.

Thirty-five years of legislation, however, had not had any great effect upon conditions on board emigrant vessels. Abuses of all kinds were still prevalent; ships were overcrowded, food supplies were often insufficient, medical equipment was rarely carried, and all too frequently typhus and cholera ravaged the vessels during their long and stormy voyages. The rate of mortality in the emigrant trade was excessively high. Charles Buller in a forceful address told parliament that, in the years prior to 1840, emigration

[9]Ships to North America excepted.

[was] resorted to as the means of relieving parishes of their paupers; and so sprung up that irregular, ill-regulated emigration of a mere labouring class which has been one of the anomalies of our time. The state exercised not the slightest control over the hordes whom it simply allowed to leave want in one part of the empire for hardship in another; and it permitted the conveyance of human beings to be carried on just as the avidity and rashness of ship-owners might choose. . . . The result of this careless, shameful neglect of the emigrants was, that hundreds and thousands of pauper families walked in their rags from the quays of Liverpool and Cork into ill-found, unsound ships, in which human beings were crammed together in the empty space which timber was to be stored in on the homeward voyage. Ignorant themselves, and misinformed by the government of the requisites of such a voyage, they suffered throughout it from privations of necessary food and clothing; such privations, filth, and bad air were sure to engender disease; and the ships that reached their destination in safety, generally deposited some contagious fever, together with a mass of beggary, on the quays of Quebec and Montreal. No medical attendance was required by law, and the provision of it in some ships was a creditable exception to the general practice. Of course, where so little thought was taken of men's physical wants, their moral wants were even less cared for; and . . . the emigrants went without any minister of religion or schoolmaster in their company.[10]

This was the situation, in general, when the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners took office in January 1840. The late Agent-General had for some time been collecting data for a revision of the 1835 act, which was still in force, and Russell instructed the Commissioners to take this under their consideration. The work required some months to complete, and meanwhile the Board took steps to secure the vigorous enforcement of the law then in operation. As a beginning all reported cases of violation were investigated. A. C. Buchanan, emigration agent in the Canadas, in his report for 1839 had complained of ships arriving short of provisions, of frauds

[10]Buller, *Speech on Systematic Colonization* (1843), pp. 48-49. Another vivid description is to be found in Durham's Report. See also Cowan, pp. 205-226 ("The Emigrant Ship and the Emigrant Trade"); although the period covered is that prior to 1837, the situation in 1840 was substantially the same.

practised by passage brokers, and of other abuses. The Commissioners ordered inquiries into the ships reported short of provisions, and considered measures for bringing passage brokers under control. Their investigations revealed that there had been no neglect of duty on the part of the agents concerned at Liverpool, Londonderry and Cork.[11] Further complaints which came from Governor Sydenham were also investigated and some remedial measures taken. One of these was to dispatch a circular to all the emigration agents making suggestions as to the enforcement of certain sections of the Passengers Act (16 October 1840). The agent was to personally inspect the supplies on vessels, make sure that the list of passengers was correct, and warn masters of the penalties. Further, each passenger vessel was required to post a price-list of provisions carried on board. A short time later the Commissioners made the further suggestion that masters guilty of violations of the act should be prosecuted in the colonial courts, and not be left for later action in the home courts.[12]

The active machinery for enforcing the provisions of the act was, of course, the corps of emigration agents stationed at the principal outports of the United Kingdom. Since all emigration was not confined to these points, at other ports the customs officers were entrusted with the duty. But even then all holes were not stopped, and from time to time complaints were received concerning ships which had fitted out at places where neither emigration agent nor customs officer was stationed, and where, therefore, there was no check upon the fulfillment of the act. For such ports the Board secured the authorization of the Treasury Lords empowering the Board of Customs, upon application being made, to send a special

[11]G. 48, pp. 234-254, 396-418. C.O. 384/61.

[12]G. 49, pp. 456-490; G. 50, pp. 63-105. Russell in approving these measures expressed the hope that they would suffice to correct the abuses complained of.—From this time on all complaints from Canada were fully investigated by the Commissioners.

officer to inspect the vessel, provided the Crown was put to no expense.[13]

In this way provision was made for enforcing the act before the ship sailed. The duty of checking up on the voyage and the condition of ship and passengers on arrival fell to the various agents in the colonies. In order to establish a uniform and exact system of reporting by these officers the Emigration Commissioners prepared some blank "forms of return." One of these was a "Ship Return" to be filled out by the colonial emigration agent upon the arrival of every emigrant ship, and then to be forwarded to the Commissioners "by the first opportunity." This return called for detailed information: name of vessel and master, tonnage, place and date of departure and arrival, number of days on the voyage; superficies of passengers' deck, number of adults permitted by Passengers Act, number of adults on board; ports touched on voyage, with date and length of time at each; cause of detention in quarantine (if so detained). Then there was a table to be filled out giving the number embarked, deaths on the voyage and in quarantine, births on the voyage, and total number landed in the colony; the table was divided so as to give for each item the number of males, females, adults, children between seven and fourteen years, and children under seven. Another part of the return gave the number of laborers, number hired at place of landing, and number of agricultural laborers, shepherds, domestic servants, and mechanics. A fourth table listed the deaths on board, with details in each instance. In the case of births the date, mother's name and sex of child were to be specified. The last two pages of the return were for data concerning those emigrants assisted by public funds, and for remarks concerning the vessel, people, food, health, surgeon, complaints, etc. In addition the Commissioners asked that quarterly abstracts be prepared, recapitulating the detailed returns for the past three months so as to show the total number of vessels, emigrants,

[13]November 1840. C.O. 386/25, pp. 259-260.

deaths, births and laborers, with any remarks to be offered. Copies of these blank returns were sent out to the governors of the North American and Australian colonies and the Cape.[14] From Buchanan, the Canadian agent, an annual report was regularly received, in addition to the periodic ones, surveying in considerable detail the year's immigration through Quebec and Montreal.

These regular, uniform returns and reports enabled the Commissioners in England to keep an accurate check upon the emigration overseas, and at the same time supplied them with a great mass of data to supervise the working of the Passengers Acts, check evasions, and ascertain the revisions necessary. As a corollary measure an important step was taken to assist the colonial authorities in the more efficient enforcement of this legislation.

We have instructed our Naval Agents to transmit through the Post, by the earliest Mail Steamers leaving this Country after every Passenger Vessel has cleared for sea at their respective Ports, a Duplicate List of her Passengers, addressed to the Immigration Agent of the Colony to which the Ship is bound. We have adopted this measure under a belief that it would be equally advantageous to the Emigrants and to the Colonists. From a knowledge of the number of Passengers to be expected before the arrival of the Vessel in which they embarked, the Colonial Authorities would be enabled whenever they should deem it advisable, to make timely provision for their reception and disposal, and to take the necessary precautions against the evils which usually attend the sudden influx of large bodies of poor people not possessed of accurate information, into places where no adequate preparation has been made for their arrival. Capitalists also and others in want of labour would be enabled, by reference to the Immigration Agent, to know what supply they might shortly expect; and the Agent himself would be enabled to exercise a check on the List furnished by the Master, and more immediately to detect any improper addition to the number on board, after the

[14]Torrens and Villiers to Stephen, 11 January 1841. C.O. 384/68. Circular from Russell to colonial governors, 11 March. G. 108, pp. 205-218. A year later some modifications were made and revised forms were prepared by the Commissioners. G. 112, pp. 608-610. See also G. 122, pp. 400-401.

Vessel had left the Port from which she cleared at the Custom House.[15]

The machinery for enforcement now seemed adequate and efficient; the next step was to revise the legislation in certain important respects. As soon as the Commissioners took office they had commenced an examination of the Passengers Act, clause by clause.[16] After months of this careful investigation and consideration proposals for a new measure were ready, but before any action could be taken Russell left office reserving the matter for his successor. The Commissioners' report was returned to them for revision and the subject was allowed to stand over for that session.[17] Early in the following year the new measure was introduced in parliament. Lord Stanley, the Colonial Secretary, in moving for leave remarked that "the country was not aware of the extent to which emigration had gone without any assistance or direct encouragement from the Government."[18] Leave to introduce was granted, but some delay was experienced in carrying the bill through as various alterations and amendments had to be made.[19] The measure finally passed and became law on August 12, 1842—5 & 6 Vict., c. 107, "An Act for regulating the Carriage of Passengers in Merchant Vessels." Under the previous law complaints of violation and evasion were constantly being received; in the new act stringent provisions were introduced to ensure a proper supply of provisions and water, to regulate the number of passengers on board, to guarantee the seaworthiness of the

[15]Commrs. to Stephen, 27 January 1841; circular to colonial governors, 3 March. G. 108, pp. 1-4. As steam vessels had not yet come into the general emigrant trade these duplicate lists arrived well in advance of the emigrants. See Traill, *Guide*, p. 42.

[16]For instances, see correspondence in C.O. 386/27, pp. 155-157; G. 51, pp. 27-32; and Rolph's testimony in report of Select Committee on Emigration from Scotland, p. 140.

[17]Commrs. to Stephen, 22 July 1841. C.O. 384/64. See also correspondence in C.O. 384/67; 73; and C.O. 386/46.

[18]*Hansard*, LX. 76-94. February 4, 1842, second day of the new session.

[19]*Ibid.*, LXI. 419-420, 837; LXII. 497; LXV. 644-667.

vessel, and to protect emigrants from frauds. The old law applied only to vessels leaving the United Kingdom;[20] the new one was to apply to the whole empire.

The main features of the new act were: The passenger limit of three persons to five tons was retained, as was the second check of one person to ten "clear feet" of deck space (except for voyages in the tropics). The minimum distance between decks was increased from five and a half to six feet. Berths were to be at least six feet by eighteen inches per person; again no more than two tiers on a deck. The ration issue was fixed at three quarts of water and one pound of breadstuffs, or five pounds of potatoes, daily. Once again the act specified the minimum length of voyage for which supplies were to be carried. No intoxicating liquors were to be sold to passengers during the voyage. As in 1835, all ships were required to carry a proper supply of medicines, and in addition those with one hundred or more passengers, or with fifty on a voyage of more than twelve weeks, were to carry a medical practitioner (ships to North American again excepted).[21] The government emigration agent or the collector of customs was to survey the supply of food and water before sailing, and to generally enforce the act. In addition, the seaworthiness of each vessel was to be ascertained by survey to the satisfaction of the Commissioners of Customs or the Emigration Commissioners. Lifeboats were now required to be carried, in the ratio of two for ships of 150 tons, three for 250 tons, and four for 500 tons up if the number of passengers exceeded 200. A new regulation of importance was that requiring dealers and brokers in the North American trade to take out licenses; the applicant was to give notice to the Emigration Commissioners twenty-one days before filing his application with a justice of

[20]But in 1840 it had been extended to cover the coolie emigration to the West Indies (3&4 Vict., c.21).

[21]In 1844 this exception was removed, 7&8 Vict., c.112, sec. xviii; and then almost immediately restored, 8&9 Vict., c.14. See C.O. 384/78, and Report 5, p. 20.

the peace; if no objection were offered the justice would then issue the license and notify the Commissioners. Foreign vessels sailing from British ports were subject to the provisions of the act, but cabin passengers on all ships were excepted. The law was to come into effect on October 1, 1842.

The first reports on the new legislation were quite favorable.[22] "As far as yet tried, it has worked satisfactorily, and proved more efficient than the one by which it was preceded." The emigration agents at the Canadian ports, acting under Sir Charles Metcalfe's instructions, were actively co-operating with the Emigration Commissioners in enforcing the "humane objects" of the law.[23] The reports of a year later were still more favorable. The beneficial effects of the act were particularly noticed in the emigration to Canada; the marked decrease in the death rate in 1843 (0.38 per cent.) was attributed to the less crowded state of the ships and to the new Passengers Act in general. Canadian officials—Buchanan and Dr. Douglass, the medical superintendent at Grosse Isle—also testified to the efficiency of the new regulations. Cases of infringement were few: seven were prosecuted at Quebec and four in the United Kingdom; in addition "many small sums have been recovered for the passengers on account of detention and other circumstances."[24] During 1844, 1845 and 1846 the act continued its "beneficial operation." But at the same time the shadows of the Three Horsemen were beginning to darken the horizons. In 1845, under the peculiar circumstances of the season, the Board issued a public notice earnestly recommending that no potatoes be shipped as part of the provisions;

[22]While the measure was still before parliament the *Colonial Gazette* praised its general principles as "excellent." *Op. cit.*, pp. 129-130; 2 March 1842.

[23]Report 1843, p. 31.

[24]Report 1844, pp. 10-16. "The Colonial Passengers' Act will . . . prove the best corrective, and the most wholesome restraint on improvident Emigration, and may calm all apprehension of inundation of destitute Emigrants." Rolph, *Emigration and Colonization*, p. 233. The Commissioners in 1844 remarked on the total absence of cases of privation.

one-half of the supply must be bread or biscuit, for the remainder Indian corn meal might be shipped.[25] This substitution of Indian corn meal for potatoes, however, was found objectionable as the meal did not keep well at sea, and permission to use it was withdrawn the next season.[26] Another disturbing sign was the great increase in the number of prosecutions necessary for violations of the Passengers Act.[27] In 1847 the storm of famine and pestilence broke; a tragic year in which regulations and restrictions collapsed before the pressure of fear-maddened humanity.

Meanwhile, it should be noted, further steps had been taken to facilitate and regulate emigrant travel. The Commissioners took advantage of the opportunity offered by the new Passengers Act in 1842 to draw up for the use of emigrant vessels proceeding to North America, a set of regulations embodying "the routine proved by experience to be conducive to good order and comfort during such a voyage." Although these rules were not compulsory and it was left to the shipmasters to voluntarily adopt them, masters and owners did show a "very general disposition to avail themselves of such regulations."[28] The mail steamers, then coming into use, proved to be of great assistance in facilitating the co-operation of the emigration agents at the various North American ports with the Commissioners in enforcing the provisions of the new act and in prosecuting violations.

If a ship should have left this country under improper circumstances, and the evasion be detected afterwards, still it is not too late, if the interval were short, to warn the officers in the colony through the steamers, and thus enable them to sue the master of the vessel on arrival. This circumstance gives the public officers

[25]Report 6, pp. 30-31. This was the first year of the potato blight in Ireland.

[26]Report 7, pp. 26-29.

[27]*Ibid.*, pp. 32-36. In 1845 there were six prosecutions; in 1846 thirty-three! This increase was in all probability entirely due to the great pressure of the emigration tide—the Irish famine flood.

[28]Report 1843, p. 33.

a much greater command, of which we have not failed to avail ourselves when requisite, over the proceedings of sailing vessels, and will we trust be an additional check to irregularity.[29]

Supplementary to this the Commissioners early in 1843 recommended to the Colonial Office another measure for the better enforcement of the laws. This was approved by Stanley and the necessary orders were issued. "With the view of affording increased protection to the emigrants," Buchanan, the agent at Quebec, was instructed to send to the Emigration Commissioners "an immediate report of all cases of infraction which may hereafter occur, together with the result of the proceedings, if any have been taken in the province, in order that it may be determined what further steps it may be requisite or advisable to adopt in England, where the parties connected with the ships are under bond to the Crown."[30]

Four years' operation, however, had shown that the Passengers Act, although on the whole highly beneficial in its effect, was by no means perfect in every detail. Since 1842 Buchanan had been turning in fortnightly reports which were forwarded, through the governor-general and the colonial secretary, to the Commissioners. All violations of the act cited therein were carefully investigated and reported upon. Most of these complaints, it was found, concerned excess number of passengers. The law provided two checks upon the total number of passengers, one by tonnage, the other by deck area; this gave rise to some confusion and misunderstanding, but in view of the fact that a new bill was under contemplation the Commissioners decided not to prosecute violations of this nature. The new law it was hoped would remedy the situation.[31]

For some months the Emigration Board had been working on the draft of a bill to amend the existing legislation in those

[29]*Ibid.*, p. 31.

[30]Commrs. to Stephen, 24 March 1843; Stanley to Metcalfe, 31 March. G. 116, pp. 294-297. See also P.P. ♯291 (1843), pp. 73-75; and P.P. ♯181 (1844), p. 5.

[31]G. 114, pp. 433-445; G. 115, pp. 113-124; P.P. ♯291 (1843), pp. 39ff.

sections where experience had found defects. "The object of most of the alterations [was] not so much to increase the stringency of the law as to render its present provisions more difficult of evasion."[32] It was proposed for instance to levy a license-tax of £5 on all emigrant brokers and "runners."[33] Some months after Grey had succeeded Gladstone as Colonial Secretary, the Commissioners completed their work and early in January 1847 sent to Stephen the draft of their amendment-bill with comments upon the proposed changes. Stephen prepared a summary of the draft, but expressed his opinion that the time was ill chosen as it would accumulate obstacles at a moment when emigration, because of the famine conditions in Ireland, should be facilitated. Hawes, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary, was of the same opinion and proposed to let the bill stand over. Grey too agreed with Stephen that this was not the time to impose extra restrictions on emigrant ships;

> but on the other hand in order to prevent public opinion both in this country and in the colonies from being directed against the system of emigration it is absolutely necessary to establish any regulations really required to guard against serious abuse—some changes in the law are also required to relieve the shipowners from inconvenient restrictions—Therefore this bill must be referred back to the Commissioners with instructions to them to prepare another confining the alterations to be now made in the law to those most urgently required and postponing to a more convenient opportunity any changes which however desirable in themselves are not urgently and immediately wanted— . . . I wish the bill to be as *short* as possible.[34]

[32]Report 6, p. 31.

[33]Commrs. to Stephen, 26 February and 11 March 1846. C.O. 384/78. Gladstone vetoed the Commissioners' proposal to tax Liverpool brokers £15.

[34]Commrs. to Stephen, 15 January 1847; and minutes thereon. C.O. 384/80. In the reply sent to the Commrs. the clause re shortness was struck out. A year later the Commrs. wrote: "The Government, after ample deliberation, came to the conclusion that it would not be advisable, at such a time, to throw unusual difficulties in the way of emigration, by any alteration of a law which had acted so successfully." So the Board prepared a short bill "to remedy defects in the working of the existing law, and adopted such precautionary measures in carrying that law into effect,

A week later, February 5, the Board had the draft of a new bill ready. The measure, just nine sections long, had an easy passage through parliament and received the royal assent on July 22, 1847.[35] By this time, however, the terrible storm had burst in Ireland.

In the spring of 1847 authorities in both the home land and the colonies were optimistic for the success of the year's emigration. Shadows of the two preceding years caused no alarm. Indeed in their Seventh Report the Commissioners wrote:

> Formerly [the agents in Canada] were compelled continually to represent the evils and abuses which fell under their eye. But all of them have since borne testimony to the benefits conferred by the amendments which have been made in the law, and by a better machinery for its enforcement. The passage across the Atlantic is said to have quite changed its character.[36]

Buchanan, the agent at Quebec, bore witness to the fact that the regulations of the act were being more strictly enforced prior to the sailing of the vessels, and that complaints and infractions of the law, in former years of frequent occurrence, were now comparatively few.[37] It was but the lull before the storm; legislative restrictions, beneficial regulations, and efficient agents were soon to be engulfed in a flood such as the world had never seen before. There had been a series of failures in the potato crop—Ireland's staple food—and by 1847 famine was universally prevalent in that unhappy island. Thousands deserted their homes to seek asylum in the nearest lands of plenty; week after week the flood poured out, and in

as were deemed most likely to be useful, without checking the stream of emigration." Report 8, p. 18.

[35] *Hansard,* XCII. 1164-1165, 1237-1241.

[36] *Op. cit.,* pp. 3-6. While admitting that there were deficiencies in the law, the Commissioners feared that if its provisions were made more strict the poor would be unable to emigrate.

[37] Report dated 3 July 1847 (!); *Journals Legis. Assem.* 1847, p. 115. Buchanan commends the increased number of emigration agents in Ireland, and the strict instructions issued by the Emigration Commissioners. See also his report for 1846 in P.P. ₰777 (1847), pp. 9-10.

that one year 258,270 persons left the British Isles! Passage to the Canadas at that period was cheaper than to the United States so the "poorest and most destitute of the starving multitude" flocked to the ports of Montreal and Quebec. "Neither the Imperial Passengers Act, then in force, nor the Colonial Laws, were calculated to meet such an emergency."[38] Both were as good as far as they went, but under the strain of these abnormal conditions their provisions proved inadequate. Frightful fever broke out on board the emigrant ships in the middle of their voyage or in the quarantine stations;[39] the mortality increased elevenfold from five in 1000 to fifty-five. When the attention of the Commons was drawn to this situation, Hawes expressed his regret at the truth of the reports but declared the government had done everything it could. There had been no neglect on the part of the emigration agents, but they had no power over the embarkation of passengers other than that of supervision.[40]

In Canada valiant endeavors were made to cope with the situation. "The Colonial Government and the members of the medical and clerical professions made the most strenuous and laudable efforts for the relief of the crowds of miserable beings thrown upon their care."[41] But it was upon the imperial government that the pressure was heaviest. It was flooded with petitions, requests, advice, and offers of all kinds. The government was urgently pressed to relieve the starvation conditions in Ireland by applying to parliament for a grant of money to promote the tide of emigration thence, and "it was with considerable difficulty [the Colonial Secretary wrote] that we were able to resist the very general wish that was expressed, that something of this kind should be attempted." The ministers, however, were "persuaded that the effect of

[38]Grey, *Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration,* I. 236.
[39]The earliest fever reports were dated 19 April 1847. P.P. #50 (1848).
[40]June 28, 1847. *Hansard,* XCIII. 972-973; XCIV. 180-182, 276-278.
[41]Grey, I. 236-239.

any interference by the Government in the manner desired, would have been to paralyse the exertions of individuals, by which alone so vast a movement of the population, as was required and was in progress, could be safely accomplished." The government, indeed, could not have interfered, for the very class of people that it was urged to "export" was the low type that neither the colonies nor America would willingly accept. Furthermore, not only would the government have to bear the expense of transporting these people to the new world, it would also be under obligation to provide for them there, for British North America could not possibly absorb such an influx all at once.[42] On the other hand the volume of voluntary, self-supporting emigration already in progress was large enough to meet the needs of the country. For these reasons the government wisely persisted in *laissez faire;* emigration was allowed to flow on voluntarily, unstimulated and unchecked, but at the same time all possible measures were taken to prevent and relieve sickness and hardship during the voyages.

The result of leaving emigration to proceed spontaneously, has thus been to effect a transfer of population from one side of the Atlantic to the other, to an extent far beyond what could have been thought of, if it had been to be accomplished by the direct agency of the State; and at the same time avoiding the enormous expense, and the abuses, which no care could have prevented, had such an operation, even upon a comparatively small scale, been carried on at public expense, by any machinery that could have been devised.[43]

During this tragic year the Commissioners and their officers were actively engaged in doing everything possible to mitigate the suffering of the famished, fever-stricken refugees from

[42]Russell, the Prime Minister, was of the same opinion: "Those who are eager for emigration on a large scale should recollect that the colonies cannot be prepared at once to receive large masses of helpless beings, and there is no use in sending them from starving at Skibbereen to starve at Montreal." Russell to Lord Bessborough, 29 December 1846. Gooch, *Later Correspondence of . . . Russell,* I. 168-169.

[43]Grey, I. 239-245.

Ireland, and to check the further spread of disease. In the middle of the year the amendment act[44] referred to above was passed, extending the provisions of the 1842 law to *all* ships carrying passengers on *any* voyage mentioned in the act, unless the number was less than one person to twenty-five tons. In certain cases the Commissioners were empowered to substitute other articles of food for those stipulated; the food required by the act was to be furnished by the owners of the vessels and was to be passed by the emigration or customs officer. Passenger ships were forbidden to carry gunpowder, vitriol or green hides as cargo. During the voyage passengers were at all times to have access to the hatchways; further salutary provisions concerning ventilation were also contained in the act. The officer at the port of clearing was to have each passenger ship surveyed, at the expense of the owners, by two or more surveyors approved by the Emigration Board. Finally the ship must be fully manned, and before sailing must secure a certificate that all requirements of the law had been fulfilled.[45] It was hoped that these measures would tend to improve health conditions on board ship, but provision was made that the act could be repealed or amended during the present session. To handle the great volume of emigration and to see to the proper enforcement of the Passengers Acts, five extra officers and an assistant were temporarily stationed at ports in Ireland and Lieut. Hodder, at Liverpool, was given two assistants. All agents were warned to be especially vigilant in their duties and to take every precaution possible. To their credit be it said that, despite the tremendous pressure upon them, the emigration officers discharged their duties faithfully. Throughout the year the laws were strictly enforced, all charges against emigrant vessels were carefully investigated, offenders were prosecuted, and in some cases licenses were cancelled.[46] The emigra-

[44]10&11 Vict., c.103; 22 July 1847.

[45]The act also provided that henceforth the government emigration agents were to be styled "Emigration Officers."

[46]See the series of Commrs.' reports printed in P.P. ♯50 (1847-8).

tion vote was more than doubled, from £10,364 for 1846-7 to £23,815 for 1847-8.

In addition to these legislative measures the Commissioners prepared a "Guide" containing some plain information and precautions to be observed by intending emigrants; three or four copies were placed on every ship going to British North America. A further precaution, taken at Grey's request, was to transmit "all remarks which are received on the emigrants from particular estates in Ireland to the proprietors, both for their information, and in order that they may have an opportunity, if they wish it, of offering any explanations on the subject."[47] Finally, during the critical part of the year, one of the Commissioners visited Liverpool, the most important centre in the emigrant trade, to investigate conditions at first hand, and see if anything further could be done.

Finally winter came and with the emigration season ended for a time the Emigration Board was able to take breath and review its work. The Commissioners felt that, in view of the sickness and general helpless condition of the emigrants, the great mortality in the year's exodus had been to a large degree unavoidable. They had taken virtually every precaution and measure possible to prevent suffering; the emigration officers had discharged their duty faithfully; and all possible instruction and information had been freely issued. But to prevent a recurrence of that disastrous year there were a few additional safeguards that might be taken. (1) The law, they suggested, might be amended so that passenger ships would be limited to one person per twelve square feet of deck space instead of ten. (2) Ships might be required to provide *all* the food for the passengers, and not merely the breadstuffs. (3) Surgeons should be required on board *all* ships. (4) To facilitate inspection, emigration should be limited to certain ports. Finally (5) the North American colonies might be requested to raise their emigrant tax to $2 per head, the shipowner to be liable

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 159.

to a higher tax if his ship were detained in quarantine.[48] The first recommendation and the second in part were adopted in an act passed in 1848. The third proposal was carefully considered both pro and con; opinions were asked from many authorities, and finally a compromise was made; complete adoption of the suggestion was not considered practicable.[49] On the fourth point no action was taken; but the fifth suggestion was forwarded to Governor-General Elgin and duly adopted, with some modifications, by the colonial governments.

Although the volume of emigration subsided somewhat in 1848, conditions were still far from normal and the Commissioners continued their close supervision. As a precaution against the recurrence of any such calamities as those of the previous year "a temporary Act for the regulation of emigrant ships to North America was passed by Parliament early in the session of 1848, to afford time for the full consideration of a permanent law."[50] The bill had a rapid passage through the Houses; it passed the first reading on February 11, the opening of the session, and six weeks later was law.[51] The title of the act (11 & 12 Vict., c.6) clearly indicated its temporary nature: "An Act to make further Provision for One Year, and to the End of the then next Session of Parliament, for the Carriage of Passengers by Sea to North America." Its main provisions were: The passenger ratio was fixed at one person per two tons, and no more than one passenger to twelve square feet on the passenger deck or thirty feet on the orlop deck; two children under fourteen years counted as one person or "statute adult," children under one year were not counted. All ships carrying over one hundred passengers were to have on board a ship's cook, approved by the emigration

[48]Report of Elliot and Rogers, 20 November 1847, reviewing the year's emigration. *Ibid.*

[49]"This is not an object which can, under present circumstances, be compulsorily provided for by law." *Ibid.*, pp. 41-44.

[50]Grey, I. 236-239.

[51]*Hansard,* XCVI. 540-541, 1024-1035.

officer, and space and equipment for cooking. Ships were also to carry a duly qualified surgeon, in default of which they were not to carry more than one passenger to fourteen feet of deck space, and each child over one year was to count as an adult. The medicine chest and the passengers were to be inspected before sailing, and a clean bill of health obtained. Any sick passengers were to be relanded, with their dependents, and the passage-money refunded. Her Majesty was empowered to issue orders-in-council prescribing regulations for order on board passenger vessels, and ships were to keep posted abstracts, prepared by the Emigration Commissioners, of these orders as well as of the Passengers Acts. "The North American Passengers Act" was to remain in force for one year or to the end of the next session of parliament.[52]

As soon as the bill had become law the Commissioners prepared the draft of an order-in-council prescribing rules for order, cleanliness and ventilation on board emigrant ships. Upon Elliot's approval Grey sent the draft to the Lord President of the Council, and ten days later the order was issued.[53] Another relief measure of that year was the vote of £140,000 from the imperial parliament to reimburse the North American colonies for the heavy expense incurred in giving assistance to emigrants during 1847. All these steps adopted to meet the crisis "were attended with complete success." There was no recurrence of the calamities of 1847.[54]

Now that the great tide of fever-emigration had subsided, the temporary act of 1848 was replaced by a much longer and more complete measure. In January 1849 the Commissioners

[52]Ships carrying less than one person to twenty-five tons were exempted from the act. The Commrs. summarized the important points as (1) increase of space and reduction of number of passengers, (2) cook, (3) surgeon, (4) regulations on board. Report 8, pp. 18ff., appendices 13 and 14. Some years earlier they had *suggested* regulations for use on board; now they were required by law.

[53]Commrs. to Elliot, 3 April 1848; order-in-council, 15 April. C.O. 384/81. See P.P. #932 (1848), pp. 43-44, and Report 8, appendices.

[54]Grey, I. 236-239. See also Reports 8, pp. 24-26; and 9, p. 31.

submitted a draft bill with a memorandum and explanations. Elliot gave his approval, but Grey complained that the draft was not in soon enough; parliament was already in session and he had had no chance for a minute examination of the bill.[55] The measure was, however, presently introduced into the Commons, once again had a fairly rapid passage through both Houses, became law on July 13, and went into effect on October 1, 1849—12 & 13 Vict., c.33.[56] Previous legislation was consolidated and the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners were formally empowered "to carry this Act into execution." Together with the governors of colonies they were authorized to appoint and discharge emigration officers. Masters of vessels were required to give all assistance to these officials, and no ship was to be cleared without a certificate from the officer at the port. Vessels were now restricted to one passenger per two tons, and in no case more than one person to twelve feet of deck space; passengers must not be carried on the orlop deck. As a check upon the enforcement of these provisions two copies were to be made of the passenger list and one, signed by the emigration officer at the port of departure, was to be deposited at the port of arrival. All ships were to be surveyed for seaworthiness before sailing, and certain specifications as to decks, beams, number of lifeboats, etc., must be met; regulations for light and ventilation were also laid down. For the first time the law required separation of the sexes above fourteen years of age, except in the case of husband and wife. In addition to bread and water, passenger ships were also to supply flour, rice, tea, sugar and molasses in prescribed quantities. The computed length of voyages was left approximately the same, as were the provisions concerning cook, doctor, and medical inspection. As usual passenger brokers for North America were to be licensed and placed under bond, and the act also provided that contract tickets,

[55]Commrs. to Merivale, 13 January 1849. C.O. 384/84.
[56]*Hansard,* CVI. 382-383.

made out according to a fixed form, were to be given in exchange for the passage money.[57] In pursuance of the provisions of the act the Commissioners immediately prepared the draft of an order-in-council, along the lines of previous ones, prescribing regulations of conduct and ventilation to be observed on board ship. This was approved by Lord Grey, referred to the Lord President of the Council, and duly issued five days after the act went into operation.[58] The hopes of the Commissioners that the new act would prove beneficial and prevent frauds were to a large degree realized. In 1849 there had been twenty-eight prosecutions for violations of the laws;[59] during 1850, however, there were only thirteen cases reported.[60]

Nevertheless conditions were not yet perfect in the emigrant trade. In parliament, early in 1850, some very unfavorable publicity was given to the subject on several occasions. The Earl of Mountcashell, who was solely responsible for this, began his attack on February 15 by drawing the attention of the Lords to gross outrages committed against women on board emigrant vessels. Earl Grey replied that an investigation was being made. "Whenever abuses had taken place, the Emigration Commissioners had not hesitated to exercise the power vested in them." He appealed to the Lords if the papers on the table "did not contain satisfactory proofs both of the pains and of the success with which the Emigration Commissioners had exerted themselves to check abuses of this kind." Cases of the nature referred to by the noble Earl were

[57]In addition to the usual exemption of the ships of Her Majesty, the Admiralty, and the East India Company, steam mail vessels, and ships carrying less than one passenger per twenty-five tons were now excepted from the provisions of the act.

[58]Commrs. to Merivale, 28 August 1849. C.O. 384/84. The order, a verbatim copy of the draft, was published in the *Gazette* October 6, and sent in circular to the colonial governors October 12.

[59]Report 10, pp. 19ff.

[60]Report 11, p. 6. As usual the emigration officers were able, in several instances, to recover for passengers sums of money illegally charged.

very few, and "so far as the . . . Commissioners were concerned, emigration was conducted with as little abuse as possible."[61] Mountcashell expressed his satisfaction, but ten days later returned to the attack. His previous charges about the *Indian,* he claimed, had been proven, and he now made further complaints about the *Una* and about the surgeons employed on emigrant ships in general. The Colonial Secretary again defended the Commissioners and agreed to a motion for papers.[62] The third broadside came just a week later when Mountcashell asked for further papers. The Secretary repeated once more that the cases of misconduct were *few* and that the mortality rate was very low. The other retaliated that "the more he inquired into the conduct of persons in emigrant ships, the more abominable it appeared to be." Although Mountcashell agreed to withdraw his motion he gave warning that he was not through,[63] and ten days later he made an extended statement in moving for papers concerning breaches of the Passengers Act and penalties imposed. Ships officers, he charged, were immoral; the surgeons were worthless; the food, especially the water, was vile; and to support his case he cited many instances and details of the conduct of surgeons and officers. The Passengers Act must be amended. Earl Grey picked holes in his arguments and again insisted that cases of misconduct were few. Lord Monteagle warmly supported Grey against this "unjust attack," and the Earl of Lanesborough bore tribute to the efficiency of ships' surgeons. Once again Mountcashell warned that he was not done.[64] A fifth time the Earl rose in the House and in an address of one and a half hours moved for more papers (22 March). The grossest debaucheries, he charged, took place on board emigrant ships, and if necessary he would bring the subject before

[61] *Hansard,* CVIII. 809-813. Charges were laid in particular against the bark *Indian* bound to Port Adelaide, South Australia.

[62] *Ibid.,* CIX. 7-14.

[63] *Ibid.,* CIX. 354-356.

[64] *Ibid.,* CIX. 954-971. Mountcashell's motion was agreed to.

parliament from session to session until it was remedied. Grey repeated his usual defense; he denied the charges, they had no foundation in fact and were futile and undeserving of consideration. This time he made objection to the printing of papers, and the motion was negatived.[65] Mountcashell did not raise his charges again.

During that year (1850) the Commissioners took an action which deserves notice. Steam vessels had been in use on the ocean for over ten years, but at first the small number and high rates had prevented their extensive use for emigration. Now they were becoming sufficiently numerous in that trade to deserve attention, and the Passengers Act was accordingly modified by the Commissioners, by virtue of the powers vested in them. The length of "computed voyage" was reduced for steam vessels, the diet was changed and other modifications were made.[66] These alterations were confirmed in 1851 by an amendment to the act. As usual the Commissioners prepared the draft of the bill, just five clauses long, and it passed the Houses with little opposition.[67] The act, 14 & 15 Vict., c.1, empowered the Commissioners to declare the number of weeks or days to be deemed the length of voyage of a steam vessel as distinct from a sailing vessel, and to distinguish, if they saw fit, between ships using steam as auxiliary and as sole power. A few other minor alterations were made concerning

[65] *Ibid.*, CIX. 1247-1258. During a dramatic moment of the debate Mountcashell drew from his pocket the rope with which, he said, four young women had been flogged on one ship. It should be noted that his complaints were laid against vessels in the Australian trade only. The subject was before the Commons only twice; see *ibid.*, CVIII. 1113-1114, 1288. Complaints of this nature are conspicuous by their rarity—a point which scarcely needs comment.

[66] Report 11, pp. 6-9.

[67] Commrs. to Merivale, 25 January 1851. C.O. 384/86. *Hansard,* CXIV. 768-771, 872-873, 1163-1166, 1312; CXV. 1. Mountcashell urged in vain that a clause be inserted requiring annual returns to parliament of the details of all convictions under the act. In the Commons a committee was proposed to consider into the working of the acts; *vide infra.*

the giving of bond by shipmasters and other points. As usual the Emigration Board put the act into immediate operation by issuing new notices concerning length of voyages, food and other items.[68] The original law and the amendatory one operated satisfactorily. The rate of mortality on the voyages remained low, and the number of prosecutions under the acts decreased still further—in 1851 there were but ten.[69]

During the course of the year a committee of the House of Commons investigated the working of the Passengers Acts and published a report containing various recommendations. A bill prepared by the Commissioners to embody these proposals was passed through parliament in the following year (1852).[70] The Passengers Acts had been growing steadily in length; 15 & 16 Vict., c.44 set a new record with ninety-one sections. The principal features of previous legislation were left unchanged, but some new provisions were introduced. Steam vessels were now allowed to carry two and a half times more passengers per tonnage than were sailing vessels. Hospital facilities were to be provided on board ship in ratio to the number of passengers; for the first time privies were required by law. The list of articles prohibited on board passenger vessels was increased; the computation of voyage length was changed, the minimum being forty days and the maximum 182; and a new dietary scale was provided with certain new requirements in the issue of food. Stowaways were to be punished. Foreign vessels carrying emigrants from British ports were required to carry an interpreter who understood the language of the crew and English.[71] Finally, the act provided

[68]Commrs. to Merivale, 30 April 1851. C.O. 384/86.

[69]Report 12, pp. 28-31.

[70]*Hansard,* CXIX. 475-476; CXX. 869-872; CXXII. 67-72. It was asserted that no new principles were contained in the bill.

[71]This clause was inserted because vessels with German or Greek crews which carried grain from the Mediterranean to Irish ports were sometimes chartered to convey emigrants to North America. See Commrs. to Merivale, 4 May 1852. C.O. 386/117, pp. 23-26.

that the Commissioners could sue and be sued, but they themselves and their private property were to be exempt from liability. After the act was passed a new order-in-council was issued, substantially the same as that of 1849.[72]

Prosecutions under the Passengers Act of 1852 remained at a low figure; in 1852 and 1853 there were twelve, in 1854 eleven.[73] Although reports indicated that the new act was working successfully, difficulty was being experienced in enforcing its provisions in vessels which sailed to foreign ports—which meant almost entirely American ports. To aid in the prosecution of these cases it was suggested that Congress pass an act similar to the British one. Communications passed between the two governments, and both the Senate and the Commons appointed committees of inquiry. Several bills were subsequently introduced into Congress; one of them became law, but it was not of the nature desired by the British. For the next fifteen years negotiations between Washington and London were carried on at intervals.[74]

An outbreak of cholera in 1854 caused a fearful loss of life on board emigrant ships and revived to some extent the panic of 1847. Emigrants were urged to observe "the salutary precautions set down by orders of Her Majesty's Land and Emigration Commissioners, and widely circulated by placard."[75] A select committee of the Commons inquired into the lamentable situation and embodied the results of its investigations in a series of eleven recommendations.[76] The draft of a new passenger bill to carry out these proposals was then carefully framed by the Emigration Board[77] and submitted to the

[72]Commrs. to Merivale, 1 October 1852. C.O. 384/89.

[73]Reports 13, pp. 24-28; 14, pp. 28-34; 15, pp. 24-28.

[74]*Ibid.;* see also *infra.*

[75]Traill, p. 43. Emigrants were cautioned to wear warm clothing (flannels), eat solid and wholesome food, and keep clean.

[76]*Hansard,* CXXXI. 203-223.

[77]That the bill was the result of long and careful deliberation is seen from a minute by T. F. Elliot, one of the original Commissioners and now

Colonial Secretary for approval at the close of the year. Under-Secretary Peel approved the draft and was requested by Grey to introduce the bill in the Commons.[78] This law—18 & 19 Vict., c.119—was the last of the great Passengers Acts, the "Magna Charta of the Emigrant."[79] Its provisions, more stringent than those of 1852, made three principal alterations. More ships were brought within the operation of the law; the number of passengers allowed on vessels was reduced; and the amount of nutriment in the dietary scale to be used on the voyage was increased. The importance of the Passengers Act of 1855 is reflected in its length, 103 sections occupying twenty-eight pages of the statute book. Some of the more important provisions were the following: A statute adult was defined as one over twelve years of age (fourteen previously), or two under twelve. All vessels[80] carrying over thirty passengers (formerly fifty) or more than one adult to fifty tons in sailing ships, twenty-five tons in steam, were subject to the provisions of the act. Sailing ships were still limited to one adult per two tons of the registered burden, but no ship was to carry more than one adult to fifteen feet of deck space. Vessels with over 300 passengers on board were to carry a medical man, as were those taking fifty or more passengers on a voyage lasting eighty days by sail or forty-five by steam. Two lifeboats were required on ships under 200 tons, three for 200 to 400 tons, four for 400 to 600, five for 600 to 1000, six for 1000 to 1500, and seven for vessels over 1500 tons. Chronometers, compasses and anchors must be carried among the

Under-Secretary in the C.O.: "The Passengers' Bill has been prepared at the Office of the Comrs who have received numerous deputations and have matured it with great pains, reporting progress here from time to time in person." Minute by T.F.E. on Commrs.' letter of 29 March 1855. C.O. 384/94.

[78]Commrs. to Merivale, 30 December 1854. C.O. 384/92. There were no debates on the bill in parliament.

[79]Egerton, *Colonial Policy*, p. 357fn.

[80]With the usual exception of government ships and mail steamers.

equipment on board ship.[81] Some alterations were made in the computation of voyage length and once again a detailed dietary scale was prescribed. Emigrant runners were required to secure a license and must in addition wear a badge. As was customary the Commissioners drafted an order-in-council, under section 59 of the act, for enforcing order and cleanliness and securing proper ventilation on board ships. The new order was an almost literal copy of its predecessor the order of 1852.[82]

The act went into force on October 1, 1855 and was strictly enforced. Eight years passed before any further amendment of the law was considered necessary. Before turning to the final evolution of the Passengers Act, however, reference should be made to some other matters of considerable importance in the regulation of emigration; for during the period 1848 to 1855, when the Commissioners were gradually working the passenger ship legislation into a perfected form, they had adopted several other measures to ensure the safety and health of emigrants. One of these concerned the carrying and stowage of deadweight as cargo on passenger ships, as for example iron from Liverpool and Glasgow. In November 1853 the Commissioners decided to adopt the rule which one of their emigration officers, Capt. Patey, had established at Glasgow and Liverpool, and circularized the other officers cautioning them to carefully check the stowage of deadweight on ships and see to it that the amount carried was not more than two-thirds of the registered tonnage.[83]

Of greater importance than this regulation, however, was the establishment of emigration depots at some of the ports of the United Kingdom. In the spring of 1849 the Commissioners took the first step in this direction when they recom-

[81]The question of crew and compass had come up for consideration in 1854, when on the recommendation of an officer of the Board of Trade Newcastle had sanctioned certain regulations; they were not put into operaton, however, before the act was passed. See C.O. 384/92.

[82]Commrs. to Merivale, 30 November 1855. C.O. 384/94.

[83]C.O. 384/92. C.O. 386/118, pp. 19-27. Great quantities of iron were being shipped from Glasgow for American railroads.

mended a depot at Liverpool as an experiment. That port was the most important centre of the emigrant trade; thousands of Irish came there every year to seek transportation to America or Australia, and all too frequently they fell prey to the "runners," unscrupulous sharpers who fleeced the unsuspecting emigrant at every opportunity. Emigrant guidebooks, indeed, generally contained warnings against this danger.[84] "At Liverpool, or any other port of embarkation for America, be careful whom you employ to show you to a shipping office; ask no questions in the street, pay no attention to the offers of services of any one you meet, not even to ask your way to any place or office, as each question may cost you five or ten shillings or more . . . "[85] There was a second problem. A large amount of the sickness amongst emigrants from Liverpool, it was charged, was contracted in the lodging houses in which the poorer class of them had been congregated in the city before sailing. To remedy these evils Lord Grey in 1848 instructed the Emigration Commissioners to inquire into the possibility of a depot to be operated by the government at Liverpool or Birkenhead where the emigrants could find accommodation while awaiting transport; here they would be protected against infection, fraud, and imposition. Although fearing that finances would present a difficult problem and that there might be many other disadvantages, the Board nevertheless outlined an experiment and submitted the case for opinion. Elliot believed it too great a responsibility for the government to assume; Grey, while considering a depot to be highly desirable, agreed with Elliot that

[84]See Report 12, pp. 16-18. Despite frequent warnings, great difficulties were encountered in preventing the operations of the sharpers. The freedom of Quebec and Montreal from "runners" was repeatedly urged as one of the advantages of travelling to Canada, even in transit to the United States. "The impositions practised upon emigrants in New York are most disgraceful, and no one who values comfort and personal safety will take that route." *Canadian Settlers' Guide*, p. 40. Is there a touch of propaganda here?

[85]*C.S.G.*, p. 40. This *Guide* was published in 1860.

it should be under the local authorities and was not prepared to sanction it being undertaken by the Commissioners.[86] The proposition was then referred to the Home Office and to the authorities of Liverpool, but since the latter also were unwilling to assume the burden the matter was dropped for the time being.[87] A private depot, however, was established in 1850 by a Mr. Sabell; a Roman Catholic prepared to follow suit, and a third depot was proposed by the Liverpool Dock Company. The reports on Sabell's establishment being quite satisfactory, the Commissioners gave their approval to such stations and appointed an additional medical inspector to aid in supervision of them.[88]

The success of these private depots encouraged the government to again take up the idea. In January 1852 a depot was opened by the government at Birkenhead on the Mersey opposite Liverpool. A second was opened late in the year at Nine Elms on the Thames below London, operated for the government by the South Western Railroad Company at a rate of one shilling three pence a day per statute adult. The emigrants would be carried to Southampton by the railroad and embarked there; a supplementary depot was erected at that terminus.[89] A fourth one was located at Plymouth. At first the spiritual needs of the emigrants in these depots were ministered to by volunteers, but before long the Emigration Board secured permission to appoint Church of England chaplains to conduct

[86]Commrs. to Merivale, 22 May; C.O. to Commrs., 16 July 1849. C.O. 384/84.

[87]C.O. 384/85. Report 11, p. 2 says the Commrs. "reported against [the plan] reluctantly"—rather a neat way of shelving the matter.

[88]Report 11, pp. 2-3. Sabell was a German.

[89]Commrs. to Merivale, 5 November 1852. C.O. 386/117, pp. 82-87. This arrangement, it was believed, would mean the discontinuance of Plymouth as an embarkation centre for government emigrants. Early in 1853 Deptford was dropped as a concentration centre and government emigrants followed the Nine Elms-Southampton route instead.

regular services at each of the four, Birkenhead, Nine Elms, Southampton and Plymouth.[90]

Over a year later a motion was presented to the House of Commons proposing that an emigration depot for free emigration to the Australian colonies should be established at one of the Irish ports. After an explanation by Mr. Peel, the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, the motion was withdrawn upon the understanding that the government would try the experiment.[91] The Emigration Commissioners then entered into a long correspondence on the subject. They were in favor of locating the depot at Cork, but before the negotiations could be completed circumstances in the field of government emigration had changed. Some of the Australian colonies, recently granted self-government, now proposed to conduct their emigration through agents appointed by themselves rather than through the imperial Emigration Board. As a result the Commissioners suggested that the scheme of a government depot at Cork be abandoned.[92]

Simultaneous with the negotiations for a depot at Cork the Commissioners had been corresponding at some length upon the subject of a hospital there. Finally the Admiralty agreed to send H. M. S. *Inconstant* to be used as a floating hospital, and by January of 1855 all arrangements were completed; the necessary equipment would be supplied by the Admiralty but all expenses were to be borne by the Emigration Board.[93] A short time later a hospital was erected at Birkenhead with a nurse in

[90]The chaplains received £100 each. The emigrants, of course, were at liberty to go elsewhere to worship if they wished. Commrs. to Merivale, 16 February 1853. C.O. 384/90.

[91]April 6, 1854; motion of I. Butt. *Commons Journals,* CIX. 182. *Hansard,* CXXXII. 579-585.

[92]Commrs. to Merivale, 26 July, 22 August and 13 November 1854; and 11 September 1855. C.O. 384/92 and 94. This is one of the first indications that the Australian colonies contemplated appointing their own agents.

[93]Commrs. to Merivale, 26 July and 28 August 1854, and 17 January 1855. C.O. 384/92.

charge and a married couple as keepers.[94] As a further protection for emigrants at Liverpool a special police officer was added to the staff of the emigration office there. The proper control of "emigrant runners" had long presented a difficult problem, and it was hoped that the appointment of Mr. Povey as special officer would serve as an effective check upon their activities.[95]

A few months after the passage of the new Passengers Act in 1855 the Commissioners, who had been experimenting for some time with new food preparations and believed their use was justified, drew up a new dietary scale; ship masters might use either the old or the new scale.[96] The supply of fresh water on board ship was also studied by the Emigration Board. After several applications had been made for permission to use apparatus to distill water, the Commissioners investigated and drafted an order-in-council authorizing its use on board steam vessels—not only as a relief to shipowners, but in the interests of the emigrants themselves.[97] This particular apparatus was allowed on steamships only because it required some mechanical knowledge and it was only on such vessels that the presence of persons with the necessary knowledge could be assured. Meanwhile the Board continued its experiments with another type that required no mechanical knowledge; "Normandy's distilling apparatus" passed the tests and a second order was

[94]Commrs. to Merivale, 15 February 1855. C.O. 384/94. This hospital was opened because of many remonstrances on the subject, and in particular because of the cholera outbreak at Liverpool in the summer of 1854. See also Report 17, pp. 20-23.

[95]Report 18, p. 25. *Vide infra.*

[96]Commrs. to Merivale, 12 April 1856. C.O. 384/96. Preserved meat, butter and bread were the principal items concerned. Sections 35 and 37 of the act had empowered the Commrs. to alter the dietary scale as they saw fit.

[97]Commrs. to Merivale, 23 March 1857. C.O. 384/98. The order-in-council was issued 6 May.

issued authorizing its use on all passenger ships, sail as well as steam.[98]

The ventilation of passenger ships was another matter of great importance. After making inquiry into various schemes for facilitating the change of air below decks the Emigration Board tried out one system of ventilation (Watson's), using four of the machines on a government emigration ship. The perfect success of the experiment led them to ask Mr. Labouchere's authority to introduce this system into all government emigration ships; permission was granted.[99]

Meanwhile the Passengers Act of 1855 was being strictly enforced and the prosecutions were numerous. In 1855 there were forty cases of violation; in 1856 sixty-six, 1857 fifty, and 1858 forty-seven; after that date the number of cases dropped sharply.[100] General satisfaction was expressed at the operation of the act. The Commissioners believed it did all that a measure of the kind could do. "It ensures a proper inspection of the ship, of her provisions, water, and fittings, and of the passengers themselves before they sail; and in the case of ships proceeding to the British colonies, it affords the means of punishing any misconduct of the officers or crew on the voyage."[101] Buchanan, the Canadian chief agent, also was pleased: "All these changes have tended materially to add to the comfort, and promote the health of the emigrant, during the past season [1856], and but one complaint was brought under my notice . . . The result of the working of this Act, so far, has on the whole been satisfactory, and would appear to have fulfilled the object of its framers . . . "[102]

[98]Reports 18, p. 24; 19, Appendix 29. In 1862 Gravely's apparatus also was approved. Report 23, Appendix 48.

[99]Commrs. to Merivale, 7 June 1856. C.O. 384/96. "A very valuable invention"—minute by Merivale or Ball.

[100]Reports 16, pp. 19-21; 17, pp. 20-23; 18, pp. 26-28; 19, pp. 18-23. It was natural that most of the prosecutions should be in, or from, Liverpool.

[101]Report 18, pp. 25-26.

[102]There was one serious disadvantage: "but it is also evident that it has operated unfavourably on the emigration to this province, and especially

In one respect, however, the situation was far from perfect; British vessels could not escape the act, but foreign ones could, and its provisions were constantly being set at nought by ships sailing under foreign flags. American ships, for example, had the trick of hiring a crew sufficient to pass the emigration officer and then relanding a part before sailing; the officers encountered great difficulty in preventing this practice.[103] Complaints were also frequently received of ill-usage on the voyage in American vessels, and of frauds in the sale in Great Britain of "inland tickets" for railroads and canals in the United States.[104] Another complication was the application of the act to foreign vessels sailing from foreign ports and calling at English ports to embark passengers—as ships from Antwerp and Bremen were wont to do.

> The instructions which we issued to our officer [at Southampton] were, in substance, that when a foreign vessel called in transitu at an English port, and there took cargo or cabin passengers only, he should not attempt to enforce the Passengers' Act against her; but that when such a vessel took steerage passengers, provided that with those already on board they made up a number sufficient to constitute her a "Passenger Ship," the Act should be enforced. The case having been subsequently referred to the law officers of the Crown, they confirmed the view which we had taken.[105]

From New South Wales came complaints of great irregularities in the German immigration there: there was no

from the Irish ports, by enhancing the price of passage . . . ; and I ought not omit to observe that the masters of several vessels, who have always heretofore brought out a full complement of passengers, have informed me, that their owners preferred to send them out in ballast, rather than subject them to the increased liability imposed by the Act." Buchanan's report for 1856, in P.P. ♯125 (1857, Sess. II), p. 7. See also Legoyt, *L' Emigration Européenne,* pp. 279-280.

[103]Report 18, p. 25.

[104]Report 19, p. 18. In the case of the tickets the Commissioners were able to recover most of the money lost. In 1857 the Board advised issuing a cautionary notice warning emigrants to wait until their arrival in the U.S.A. before buying inland tickets. Commrs. to Merivale, 11 March 1857. C.O. 386/84, pp. 17-19.

[105]Report 18, pp. 25-26.

separation of the sexes, resulting in gross immorality; there was no sufficient inspection of fittings, provisions, or passengers, no effectual precaution against overcrowding; the issue of provisions and water was irregular and insufficient. The colony suggested a local act to punish such practices, but the governor, Sir W. Denison, realizing that the matter was one of considerable difficulty, wisely suggested that preventive measures would be better taken at the port of embarkation. The Commissioners on considering the subject also suggested that steps might be taken by the legislatures of the cities of Bremen and Hamburg to remedy matters, and that the colonial legislature also might pass certain laws.[106]

It was just about this time (1857-1858) that a Dr. Custis attracted considerable attention by his letters concerning outrages on board emigrant ships to the United States. From the information he cited the Commissioners were able to investigate but one case, and they were, on the whole, strongly inclined to question the accuracy of his statements. "It seems incredible that if the scenes of profligacy, violence, and indecency described by Dr. Custis had actually taken place—still more if, as is alleged, they are of common occurrence—no appeal or complaint should be made by the emigrants on their arrival either to the local magistracy or to the British consul; nor should any thing have been heard of it in this country except through Dr. Custis's letters." The Commissioners did not deny that immorality occurred, but they pointed out that the Passengers Act was not binding on a foreign ship, and American shipping not only predominated in the Liverpool-New York trade but was beginning to enter the Australian also. In ships going to the British colonies cases of violence and outrage were rare because of the stricter enforcement of the laws.[107]

[106]Report 19, p. 23. The self-governing colonies as a rule soon passed laws regulating immigration, as *e. g.* the Canadian Provincial Passengers Act.

[107]Report 18, p. 16.

After 1858 the number of prosecutions for violation of the Passengers Act declined sharply; in 1859 twenty cases were reported, in 1860 twenty-six, in 1861 but six, 1862 eight and 1863 eight.[108] The Commissioners were satisfied that the act was working satisfactorily. Nevertheless a certain amount of criticism was being directed against it and in the Commons a motion was made for a committee on the act. Murdoch considered the case and wrote his superiors that he did not believe the committee was necessary; Elliot concurred—he could see no sufficient public ground for granting the motion.[109] There were four principal objections to the act. (1) It was charged that burdens were imposed on British ships from which foreign ones were exempt. (2) The act thereby threw the carriage of emigrants into the hands of foreigners, and (3) had consequently diverted emigration from British colonies to the United States. Finally it had increased the expense of passage so much as to seriously impede emigration. To each of these charges the Commissioners made reply. The first, they claimed, was incorrect. For the second, figures were quoted to show that there had not been a *great* loss in emigrant trade to foreigners. Thirdly, the diversion of emigration was not attributable to the act but rather to the fact that Canada was unable to absorb the huge numbers going to America, and to the remittances sent to Ireland. Finally the decrease in emigration was not due to the law but to a decrease in the emigrating population.[110]

Despite these objections the law of 1855 remained unchanged until 1863. Then, at the recommendation of the Emigration Commissioners, a bill to make certain amendments was introduced into parliament and passed, without much debate, almost in the original form.[111] The act, 26 & 27 Vict., c.51,

[108]Reports 20, p. 20; 21, pp. 22-25; 22, pp. 13-14; 23, pp. 14-16; 24, pp. 18-19.

[109]Memo. by Murdoch, 17 March 1859. C.O. 384/99.

[110]Report 20, pp. 20-26.

[111]July 13, 1863. *Hansard,* CLXXI. 1275-1277; CLXXII. 243. In Report 23 (p. 14) the Commrs., after referring to the continued successful opera-

went into operation on the first day of October. It enlarged the definition of passenger ship to include every sea-going vessel carrying over fifty passengers, or more than one adult to thirty-three tons if sail, twenty tons if steam; mail steamers were no longer exempted. The tonnage check on the passenger limit was repealed, leaving only the check by deck space. Lists of cabin passengers were now required; some changes were made in the dietary scale. Bond for shipowners not living in the United Kingdom was fixed at £5000. The carriage of some horses and cattle was now permitted under certain conditions, and certain ambiguities in the previous act were cleared up. At the same time that the act was passed the order-in-council of 1855 was revived to check irregularities and immorality in emigrant ships. The Commissioners, however, pointed out that unless the authorities in the colonies enquired into all emigrant ships, and not only government ones, the regulations would be nugatory.[112]

In 1868 negotiations, first opened in 1854, for a passenger ship agreement or convention between the United States and Great Britain, were resumed. They continued from time to time until 1873, and the convention was still hanging fire when the Emigration Board was abolished.[113]

In 1870 a minor amendment was made in the Passengers Act. The carriage of gunpowder on passenger ships had been forbidden, but after an exception had been made in the case of one ship,[114] the Emigration Board was instructed to prepare the draft of a bill empowering the Secretary of State to authorize any passenger ship to carry as cargo naval and military

tion of the act of 1855, added: "Some amendments, however, appear to be required, and we have accordingly submitted to your Grace the draft of a Bill to be introduced into Parliament for that purpose."

[112]Report 24, pp. 18-19 and Appendix 38.

[113]See C.O. 386/86; C.O. 384/101, and Reports 29 to 32. In 1870 Murdoch during a visit to Washington had some conservations on the subject with the Secretary of State.

[114]Murdoch to Rogers, 14 December 1869. C.O. 386/86, pp. 142-143.

stores for the public service. Some months later the law took its place on the statute books as 33 & 34 Vict., c.95 (9 August 1870).[115]

By this time the hardest part of the Commissioners' work was done. The character of the emigration trade had undergone a great change; its worst days were past, and now conditions were steadily improving. More and more iron steamships were coming into use; ships were larger and safer; voyages were shorter; the passengers' health and comfort on the voyage were more carefully guarded; step by step the Passengers Act had been perfected. In short, emigration, once irregular and unsupervised, was now an orderly and systematic branch of the great shipping trade. It seemed unlikely that any great changes in the legislation would be necessary for some time; it remained only to enforce the existing laws. In view of these facts it was decided to transfer the enforcement of the Passengers Acts to another governmental bureau, the Board of Trade, which supervised shipping in general. To this end, the Emigration Board, at the close of 1870, prepared the draft of a bill to incorporate both the Passengers and Merchant Shipping Acts.[116] It was over a year, however, before another bill became law.[117] This act, which was to go into operation on January 1, 1873, provided that "all powers and duties vested in or imposed on the Emigration Commissioners by the Passengers Act, 1855, and the Passengers Act Amendment Act, 1863, shall be transferred to and imposed on the

[115]Murdoch to Rogers, 31 January 1870. C.O. 386/119, pp. 14-16.

[116]Murdoch to Herbert, 9 December 1870. C.O. 386/119, pp. 107-108. The Commrs. in Report 31 (p. 6) noted that "the draft of a new Act embodying the provisions of existing Acts with such slight modifications as experience suggests, has been prepared." Report 32 (p. 5) remarked that the new act had not yet been passed.

[117]A copy of the new bill was sent to Murdoch for report; he had no objection to offer. Holland to Commrs., 13 June; Murdoch to Holland, 14 June 1872. C.O. 384/100.

Board of Trade,"[118] The Commissioners' work in this field was done.[119]

[118]35&36 Vict., c.73; 10 August 1872. "An Act to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts and the Passenger Acts." Section 5 further provided that "In the construction and for the purposes of the said Acts, the name of the Board of Trade shall be deemed to be substituted for the name of the Emigration Commissioners, and anything which might . . . have been done by the . . . Commissioners, whether acting independently or under the sanction or authority of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, may be done by the Board of Trade independently of such sanction or authority."—There were no debates on the bill in parliament. *Hansard,* CCXII, CCXIII.

[119]The operation of the Passengers Act in the last years of the Commissioners' supervision may be briefly summarised: 1864 twelve cases, 1865 six, 1866 seven, 1867 eight, 1868 five, 1869 seven, 1870 eight, 1871 eight, and 1872 two. In addition to these prosecutions the emigration officers were able to recover without resort to legal proceedings sums varying between £2453 and £6397. Reports 25 to 33.

VI

THE EMIGRATION OFFICERS

WHEN the Commission was established it was instructed to exercise a general supervision over the emigration agents stationed at the various outports of the United Kingdom. They were all men selected from the Royal Navy, and with one exception held the rank of lieutenant.

These Officers act under the immediate Directions of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners, and the following is a summary of their Duties:—They correspond with any Magistrates, Clergymen, Parish Officers, or others who may apply to them for Information as to the Facilities for Emigration from their respective Stations. They procure and give gratuitously Information as to the sailing of Ships and Means of Accommodation for Emigrants; and, whenever applied to for that Purpose, they see that all Agreements between Shipowners, Agents, or Masters, and intending Emigrants, are duly performed. They also see that the Provisions of the Passengers Act are strictly complied with, viz. that Passenger Vessels are seaworthy, that they have on board a sufficient Supply of Provisions, Water, Medicines, etc., and that they sail with proper Punctuality.

They attend personally at their Offices on every Day, and afford gratuitously all the Assistance in their Power to protect intending Emigrants against Fraud and Impositions, and to obtain Redress where Oppression or Injury has been practised on them.[1]

By the general public their work was little appreciated; harassed emigrants anxious to escape misery at home and reach the promised land sometimes, if not often, regarded the measures taken by the agents to ensure a safe and comfortable voyage as merely new obstacles thrown in the way of their speedy departure. Such is frequently the fate of well-doers; but the importance and value of the work performed by this little band of men can hardly be over-estimated. The Commissioners found in them "the zeal, intelligence, and compre-

[1]Colonization Circular, 13 May 1843.

hension of the principles of the public service, which was to be expected from the profession to which they belong."[2]

At the beginning of 1840, when the Commission began its work, there were eleven agents stationed at London, Liverpool, Bristol, Greenock, Leith, Dublin, Cork, Belfast, Limerick, Sligo, and Londonderry; Liverpool had in addition an assistant agent. They received £208. 5. 0 each and the assistant agent £100.[3] Early in March Lieutenant Low, the agent at Liverpool, the most important post, died; Henry was transferred from Bristol to the vacancy. The Commissioners had been contemplating a revision of the agencies, and as the emigration from Bristol had of late been inconsiderable they took the opportunity to reduce the number of agents by one; no new officer was appointed to that post.[4] At the end of the first quarter of 1840, then, the officers of the corps were as follows: Lieut. Henry and Mr. James (Liverpool), Lieuts. Lean (London), Hemmans (Greenock), Forrest (Leith), Hodder (Dublin), Friend (Cork), Ramsay (Londonderry), Starke (Belfast), Shuttleworth (Sligo), and Mr. Lynch (Limerick).[5] Not until the early part of 1844 were any important changes made in this roster of agents.

London and Liverpool were by a considerable margin the busiest and most important of the outports, and the two agents there—Lieuts. Lean and Henry—had proportionately more work to do. For this reason the Commissioners, feeling it was only just that they should receive greater compensation, recommended an increase of £100, bringing their salary to £308. 5 per annum.[6] Lieut. Lean was also provided with an assistant

[2]Report 1842, p. 16. The profession, of course, was the Navy.

[3]C.O. 384/62. *Vide supra.*

[4]Commrs. to Stephen, 12 and 30 March 1840. C.O. 384/62. Until Henry reached his new post, 16 April, James, the assistant agent remained in charge. C.O. 386/25, p. 8. Low was the first emigration officer appointed.

[5]C.O. 386/24, pp. 255, 288. See also C.O. 386/25, pp. 8, 173; 26, pp. 1, 278; 27, pp. 223-224; 28, pp. 45, 259; 33, p. 1.

[6]Commrs. to Stephen, 8 August 1840. C.O. 384/62. Stephen to Commrs., 5 September. C.O. 384/59.

at £60, and received £150 per annum for office rent and other expenses.[7] Two years later the continued increase of emigration business led to recommendations for further additions. More assistance being needed at Liverpool a clerk was provided at £60 per annum. The agent at Cork often had to make official journies to Cove; an annual grant of £30 was recommended, £15 for securing assistance and £15 for journey expenses. Finally a sum of about £100 was needed for miscellaneous disbursements; out of this the Cork grant could be paid, and postage and other extraordinary expenses at Sligo. Stanley saw no objections to these proposals, but enquired if some agents could not be dispensed with at the ports of least business.[8] The Commissioners replied that no reduction of agents was possible, and defended their request for further finances.[9] The addition of £60 for a clerk at Liverpool and £100 for miscellaneous expenses was thereupon authorized.[10]

The frequency of Lieut. Friend's journies to Cove soon made it appear advisable to transfer the office thither from Cork. Furthermore the Corporation of Cork which had been paying the rent for the agent's office, in 1843 reduced it to a vote of £12 per annum at pleasure. The Commissioners deemed this a good opportunity to ask Stanley's sanction to remove Friend's station to Cove, and to use part of the £30 sum previously granted for his journies to pay the office rent. Stanley at once approved.[11] The new post was a few miles below Cork —the present day Queenstown or Cobh. Later in the year the increase of emigration from southern England made it necessary to have a closer check upon the shipping there.[12] As the

[7]For correspondence see C.O. 384/62.

[8]Commrs. to Stephen, 29 August 1842. C.O. 384/73.

[9]Commrs. to Stephen, 7 October 1842. *Ibid.*

[10]Commrs. to Stephen, 15 November 1842. *Ibid.*

[11]Commrs. to Stephen, 8 March 1843. C.O. 384/76.

[12]There were but two agents in England, at London and Liverpool. "We think it very probable . . . from the extension of Emigration [to Plymouth], that we shall have to submit a proposal . . . before the next

emigration from Leith was quite small, it was proposed to transfer the agent there to Plymouth, leaving the officer at Greenock to handle both that port and Glasgow as well. The Colonial Office deferred action temporarily as some petitions had gone to the Commissioners, but when they promptly repeated their recommendation Stanley gave his approval: "The case is very clear."[13] In making the transfer the two agents traded; Forrest went from Leith to Glasgow, while Hemmans left Greenock for the new post at Plymouth.

Early in the following year (1845) when Lieut. Henry (Liverpool) was compelled by ill health to tender his resignation, the Board proposed to transfer Hodder from Dublin to Liverpool and to hire an officer at £120 per annum for three years to fill the vacant Irish post. An increase of £30 to the second officer at Liverpool and the grant of £50 for office rent were also recommended. Stanley hesitated to approve and asked first for a list of ports, officers, salaries and volume of emigration. After studying these data he recommended that the agent at Sligo be transferred instead of the one at Dublin. The latter city was the capital and it might seem "invidious" to make the reduction there; furthermore the data showed that the emigration thence was larger than from Sligo. Elliot thereupon drafted a letter proposing that Hodder should go to Liverpool, and that the agent at Sligo be offered the option of going to Dublin at the regular salary or remaining at Sligo on reduced pay.[14] The situation was solved by Lieut. Henry who wrote to say that he felt equal to duty at a less arduous station and asked to be transferred to Dublin. The Commissioners and Stanley both immediately gave their approval.[15]

season for transferring one of the present Emigration Officers to that Port." Commrs. to Stephen, 8 December 1843. C.O. 384/74.

[13]Commrs. to Stephen, 6 and 9 February 1844. C.O. 384/76. C.O. 386/35, p. 293.

[14]Commrs. to Hope, 25 January 1845. C.O. 384/77.

[15]Commrs. to Stephen, 7 March 1845. *Ibid.*

There were no other changes in the corps of emigration officers until 1847.[16]

In that terrible famine year occurred one of the two instances of the dismissal of an agent. Lieut. Hemmans early in 1844 had been transferred from Greenock to the new post at Plymouth; almost three years to the day later the three Commissioners—Elliot, Wood and Rogers—were reluctantly compelled to recommend that he be relieved from his office because of "want of alertness and regularity" in his proceedings. Complaints against him had been carefully investigated; he had been given a chance to reply and his answers were not satisfactory. Witnesses declared that he had danced around the capstan with female emigrants, and that he had used improper language; other charges, some of which Hemmans admitted, were made concerning laxity in performing his duty. The Commissioners' report caused long discussion in the Colonial Office; Stephen advised proceeding with caution, more proofs should be secured; Hawes agreed with him. But Grey differed from his subordinates. The responsibility in the first instance lay with the Commissioners, not with him; they were to act, an appeal might then be made to the Secretary of State. As the Commissioners appointed the agents, so they had the authority to dismiss; he hoped that they would not exercise this power lightly, but as to the merits of the case he would express no opinion. The "buck" being passed back to the Commissioners, Hemmans was relieved and Lieut. Carew, R. N., was subsequently recommended for the post at £120 per annum for three years.[17]

[16]See C.O. 386/36, pp. 80, 302; 37, pp. 390-391; 38, pp. 7-8, 173; 39, pp. 43-44, 390; 40, pp. 279-289; 41, pp. 316, 324.

[17]Commrs. to Stephen, 27 February 1847; C.O. to Commrs., 8 March; Commrs. to C.O. (re Carew), 19 March. C.O. 384/80. Hemmans' friends raised a storm, but the Commrs. stood firm and Grey supported them. Just about this time (11 March) the Commrs. proposed that in future appointments to permanent posts be for three years only, subject to renewal if satisfactory; hence Carew's limited appointment. This decision was no doubt motivated by the Hemmans affair. *Ibid.*

The mad rush of fear-stricken people from Irish ports in 1846 had placed extra burdens upon the six officers stationed there, and since a greatly increased emigration was expected for 1847 additional agents were absolutely necessary. The rule in the past had been an agent at each port which sent 1000 or more emigrants annually. On this basis five more were needed in Ireland at Galway, Newry, Tralee, Waterford and Baltimore. In addition many complaints had been received concerning the emigration from Ballina, Killala, Ballyshannon and Donegal—outports of Sligo—so that an officer was needed there for that one year at least. Lieut. Shuttleworth (Sligo) had been instructed to attend to these ports in addition to his own; but since one officer could not effectively perform all that work, a second agent was immediately recommended. The Commissioners proposed that this second officer and the others appointed that year should be temporary only and should receive £10 a month plus half pay and travelling expenses. The increasing pressure of emigration also made another assistant necessary at London.[18] By the first of April 1847 all the new appointments had been made; Carew to Plymouth, Patterson, Robinson, Dennehy, Moriarty, and Ellis to the temporary Irish posts at Galway, Newry, Tralee, Baltimore, and Waterford, Woolridge to the outports of Sligo, Smith to London, and finally Prior to Liverpool.[19]

Liverpool continued to lead all the other emigration ports by a safe margin.

> [From that port] more than four-fifths of our emigrants embark. In the spring and summer months of 1846, more than 70,000 emigrants left that port alone. Many ships might leave the Mersey in one morning, and yet it is supposed that one agent, whose staff consists of an assistant and a clerk, has taken the measurements,

[18]Commrs. to Stephen, 11 and 12 March 1847. C.O. 384/80.

[19]Commrs. to Stephen, 8 April 1847. *Ibid.* All were officers in the Royal Navy; all held rank as lieutenants except Ellis who was a commander and Smith who is listed as "esquire." Prior received £150 per annum, the others £120. C.O. 386/53, pp. 242-243. In 1848 Woolridge was succeeded by Moriarty from the temporary post at Baltimore.

examined the provisions, counted the passengers, and generally inpected the accommodations of all these ships, whose owners have a manifest interest in evading his investigations. . . . The present Liverpool agent [Hodder] is, I am told, very active; the energies of one man are, however, wholly inadequate to such duties.[20]

So wrote Mills in 1847. In that year there were 132,459 and in 1848 131,132 emigrants from Liverpool; the indications in the spring of 1849 were that the flow that year would be larger than ever. Hodder certainly was in need of an additional assistant. The Commissioners asked for £100 for that year and, upon the approval of Grey and the Treasury, appointed George Ramsden, R. N., early in May;[21] the appointment, however, proved to be for more than the one season. About the same time the Board proposed that, in view of the great number of ships clearing from London, Lean's clerk should receive £80, and that because of the large exodus through Plymouth to Australia in 1848 the agent there (Carew) should receive the same salary as his predecessor (£208.5).[22]

The year 1850 was a particularly fatal one for the emigration agents; in the five months from mid-February to mid-July no less than four succumbed. Lieut. Forrest (Glasgow) died suddenly in February and was succeeded by Capt. Charles G. E. Patey, R. N.[23] Then Mr. Lynch (Limerick) passed on;

[20]Mills, *Systematic Colonization,* p. 24.

[21]Commrs. to Merivale, 29 March and 14 July 1849. C.O. 384/84. The Commrs., in Report 11, p. 3, referred to the great increase in the last three years (1847-50) of emigration from Liverpool due to the cheapness of ships and their superior accomodations there. Formerly Liverpool had been engaged almost entirely in the American trade, but ships were now sailing for Australia as well. Steam vessels were beginning to enter the emigrant trade.

[22]Commrs. to Merivale, 12 February 1849. C.O. 384/84. The Board pointed out that these and other increases proposed would be counteracted in part by a decrease in expenses due to the removal of the extra Irish agents.

[23]Commrs. to Merivale, 25 February 1850. C.O. 384/85.

Commander Ellis was transferred from Waterford with an increase of pay to £208. 5. The vacant post at Waterford was given to Commander Rowlatt (£120), who had already served for two years on African emigrant ships.[24] A few weeks later it was necessary to fill the post at Sligo left vacant by Lieut. Shuttleworth's death, and then that at Londonderry held by the late Lieut. Ramsay. Lieut. William C. Saunders, R. N., went to Sligo with a salary of £120, and Mr. E. H. Smith went to Londonderry. The latter had been assistant emigration agent at London, and because of the able manner in which he had performed the arduous duties seemed the best officer to promote. As a rule only lieutenants were appointed as chief agents, and Smith's rank was merely purser and paymaster; but Grey "entirely concurred" in the appointment. Ramsden, with a salary of £120, succeeded him at London.[25] Meanwhile another addition to the corps had become necessary. The port of Limerick was situated at some distance above the mouth of the river, and many complaints had been made of the surreptitious introduction of emigrants into ships after they had cleared from the port. To check this practice the assistance of the customs officer stationed at the mouth of the river had been enlisted, but he had too much other work to attend to; an assistant emigration officer was therefore appointed at £100 a year. This officer, Mr. G. H. FitzGerald, retired Army captain, had the distinction of being one of the few non-naval men to be appointed to the emigration agency service.[26]

These changes together with those of the next four years resulted in an almost complete change of personnel in the corps

[24]Commrs. to Merivale, 11 June. *Ibid.* Waterford had been retained as a permanent post instead of a temporary one.

[25]Commrs. to Merivale, 9 and 22 July, and 4 October 1850. *Ibid.* Saunders was appointed in May. Ramsden had been appointed to Liverpool in 1849 but had resigned a year later and was succeeded as assistant emigration officer by Lieut. Thomas Higgins, R.N., at the same salary (£100) in April 1850.

[26]Commrs. to Merivale, 17 April and 31 July 1850. *Ibid.* He was appointed at the end of July; the post was known as Tarbert.

of emigration officers. Commander Rowlatt, appointed to Waterford in 1850, and Lieut. Edward Griffiths, in charge of the liberated Africans at St. Helena, exchanged posts, the new agent taking over from his predecessor at the beginning of November 1851 at the same salary.[27] Towards the close of that year Capt. Moriarty (Sligo) died; since 1848 there had been two officers at that post, but it was believed that one could now do the work. Capt. Robert Kerr, R.N., once temporarily at Waterford, was appointed to take the consolidated agency in March 1852.[28] Meanwhile some serious charges touching ships sailing to New Orleans from Liverpool had been brought to the attention of the Commissioners and a full investigation was begun. Hodder and Higgins were summond to London to offer explanations in person; these were not satisfactory. Hodder had not measured the ships as required by law, and the Board refused to accept his plea of pressure of business as an excuse for neglect of duty. The officer had a record of seventeen years' good service, but the Commissioners now had lost much of their confidence in him and proposed exchanging him with Patey of Glasgow. Elliot "regretfully" gave his opinion that the Commissioners' course seemed more lenient than was justified; Grey concurred. Hodder could not properly be employed even in a post where the duty was less arduous if the Commissioners' confidence in him was gone; "his services ought to be altogether dispensed with," while Patey should be moved to Liverpool and directed to report on the situation there so the Commissioners could see if the establishment required strengthening.[29] Hodder was thereupon removed from

[27]Pending the arrival of Griffiths at his new station, Capt. Kerr was appointed agent *ad interim,* April-November. Commrs. to Merivale, 12 April and 6 December 1851. C.O. 384/86.

[28]Instead of two officers at £120, there would be one at £208. 5, a saving of £31.15. Commrs. to Merivale, 23 December 1851 and 8 March 1852. *Ibid.,* and C.O. 384/89.

[29]Commrs. to Merivale, 4 June 1851 (24 mss. pp.); C.O. to Commrs., 19 June. C.O. 384/88. This seems rather hard on Hodder who had not been allowed to plead pressure of work.

service "in consequence of the neglect which occurred in the measuring of certain Vessels which recently sailed from Liverpool for New Orleans." Elliot was sorry for him, but it was the only course. Grey "entirely concurred"; Hodder's omission of that important duty was an insurmountable objection to his remaining in the service. Patey took over at Liverpool on July 17 with a salary of £308. 5; and Commander Marcus F. Brownrigg, R.N., succeeded him at Glasgow (at £208. 5).[30]

The new officer at Liverpool reported at once on the establishment there, and, as a result of the large volume of business reported, two new officers were added. Mr. K. L. Sutherland, R.N., was appointed as third assistant at £100 plus half pay, and Mr. William R. Wills as clerk at £50 per annum. These new appointees were approved subject to a falling off in the emigration from Liverpool.[31] This had hardly been arranged before the Commissioners came out with a round of salary increases. Liverpool's emigration had increased fivefold; the laborious duties of the officers there were to be rewarded by £350 for the chief officer, £200 for the first assistant, £150 for the second and third, and £100 for the first clerk. Capt. Lean at London was to receive the same salary as Patey, £350, his first assistant £150, and his clerk 6/–a day; in the case of London these increases were to be paid out of Australian funds.[32] But it seemed that Liverpool could not be kept on an adequate establishment; two officers had been added and the salaries raised, and then again the great increase in the number of emigrants to America and particularly to Australia made still more assistance essential. Two additional officers at £150,

[30]Commrs. to Merivale, 1 July and 13 August 1851. C.O. 384/86. Hodder was dismissed on 26 June.

[31]Commrs. to Merivale, 13 August and 6 December 1851. *Ibid.* They were added to the establishment of chief officer (£308. 5), first assistant (£150), second assistant (£100), and clerk (£80).

[32]Commrs. to Merivale, 17 December 1851 and 8 March 1852. *Ibid.*, and C.O. 384/89. The increases at Liverpool were to date from 1 April 1852; the officers were Patey, Prior, Higgins, Sutherland, and Lawes; Wills (£50) did not receive an increase.

a ship carpenter at 40/– a week, and £20 a year for stationery were asked for, with an increase of £50 a year to the chief officer and his assistants as long as the abnormal pressure lasted. These changes were approved; Patey now received £400, Prior £250, and Higgins and Sutherland £200, while Pike and Bourchier were appointed as the new assistants also at £200 (July 1852).[33]

Other ports were in need of assistance. Galway had been made a temporary agency during the rush year of 1847; by 1851 emigration had again increased to such an extent that the customs officers could not properly enforce the regulations of the Passengers Act. Lieut. W. C. Saunders, R.N., was accordingly stationed there, in March 1852, as emigration agent at a salary at £120.[34] A short time after Glasgow had been given a clerk or messenger, at 20/– a week, the emigration officer there, Capt. Brownrigg, resigned; then Capt. James A. Stevens, R. N., after serving for three weeks relinquished the post and was succeeded by Capt. Charles Keele, R.N.[35] In London there were further changes in salary and personnel. The second assistant officer resigned and was replaced by Mr. John I. Forster, R.N.[36] Then both assistants went on sick leave and the Commissioners, in view also of the great pressure of work on the London staff, recommended the appointment of two additional assistants at £150, with increases of £50 for the first and second assistants, £40 for the clerk, and £50

[33]Commrs. to Merivale, 18 June and 9 September 1852. *Ibid.*

[34]Plus half pay as usual. The Commrs. recommended also an office allowance of not more than £20 per annum each for Sligo and Limerick. Commrs. to Merivale, 13 November 1851 and 8 March 1852. C.O. 384/86 and 89. Saunders had previously been at Sligo.

[35]Commrs. to Merivale, 18 June and 22 July 1852. C.O. 384/89. Stevens served from 24 June to 16 July; Keele took over on 17 July; both received the same pay as their predecessor, £208. 5.

[36]At £100 from 3 May 1852; Forster's predecessor was Mr. P. P. Cotter, R.N. Commrs. to Merivale, 3 July 1852. *Ibid.* The London staff now consisted of chief officer, assistant (£150), second assistant (£100), and clerk (£80).

extra for Captain Lean during the present pressure of emigration. Pakington, the Colonial Secretary, gave his approval: "I quite concur—no public officers ought to be so worked—nor can the public service be carried on as it ought to be on such terms."[37] The staff as reorganized consisted of Lean, chief emigration officer (£400), Ramsden, first assistant (£200), Forster, second assistant (£150), Westbrook, third assistant (£150), Mann, fourth assistant (£150), and Rennell, clerk (£120).[38] A few months later it was found that, to promote the efficient and economical operation of the London office, it was advisable to station one member permanently at Gravesend, where the final muster of crews and passengers usually took place. The sum of £20 was accordingly appropriated for an office at Gravesend for this officer.[39]

Before the year ended three more vacancies had to be filled. The post at Belfast vacated by the death of Lieut. Starke was filled by Commander Michael de Courcy, R.N. Lieut. Henry, after long years of service, resigned from Dublin because of ill health and failing sight, and was succeeded by Capt. Charles F. Schomberg. Finally Lieut. Charles M. Luckraft took over the office resigned by Lieut. I. W. Pike, the third assistant at Liverpool.[40]

Changes in personnel during the year 1853 affected the offices at Liverpool, Dublin, Sligo, Londonderry, and Cork, while a new office was added to the list. Capt. Patey resigned his post at Liverpool; Capt. Schomberg was transferred

[37]Commrs. to Merivale, 6 August 1852. *Ibid.* A high tribute was paid to Captain Lean.

[38]Commrs. to Merivale, 9 September 1852. *Ibid.* Colonial funds supplied £41.15 towards Lean's salary, and £30 towards Ramsden's. Westbrook and Mann were appointed at the very end of August.

[39]Commrs. to Merivale, 18 December 1852. *Ibid.* This sum was much less than the previous expense for travelling to and fro.

[40]Commrs. to Merivale, 3 September and 14 December 1852. *Ibid.* De Courcy was appointed from 21 June at £208. 5, and Schomberg from 8 July at the same salary; Luckraft received £150 with the temporary extra grant of £50, from 3 December.

thither from Dublin, Capt. Kerr from Sligo to Dublin, and Capt. William A. Willis, R.N., was appointed to the vacancy at Sligo.[41] Some months later Thomas Dixon was approved for the office of clerk at Liverpool resigned by William Lawes.[42] Early that year it had become necessary to open an agency at Southampton. The South Western Railway Company in 1852 had made arrangements for dispatching emigrants from that port, which meant that an officer had to be sent from London whenever it was necessary to clear a ship—a very inconvenient practice. Mr. Smith was therefore transferred from Londonderry to become agent at Southampton; Mr. Sutherland went to Londonderry from Liverpool, and was in turn replaced by Mr. R. J. Wiggins.[43] Finally assistance was requested for the agency at Cork. The situation there was similar to Glasgow; ships took on their supplies at Cork and passengers at Cove or Queenstown. Two offices were therefore necessary; to attend to one office in the absence of the agent a man was hired, his wages being paid out of the contingencies sum.[44]

Again in 1854 the service was much changed in personnel, and then comparative stability was reached. The agency at Liverpool was further augmented. The Commissioners secured the consent of the Treasury to appoint an officer for one year, at £200, to superintend and report upon the stowage of cargo on board passenger ships at the port on the Mersey;

[41]Schomberg was to receive £350, plus the £50 extra grant, from 6 January, Kerr £208. 5 from the same date, and Willis £208. 5 from 14 January. Commrs. to Merivale, 24 January 1853. C.O. 384/90.

[42]Dixon was to receive £100 from 1 July. Commrs. to Merivale, 7 July 1853. *Ibid.*

[43]Commrs. to Merivale, 5 February and 18 April 1853. *Ibid.* Smith was to receive the usual salary for an emigration officer, £208. 5. The S.W.Ry. was operating emigrant depots at Nine Elms and Southampton (*vide supra*).

[44]About £25 a year; the sum was not fixed. Commrs. to Merivale, 29 August 1853. C.O. 384/90. In 1843 the agent had been transferred from Cork to Cove.

R. W. Evatt was appointed to the new post. At the same time a similar official was sanctioned at Glasgow, also as a year's experiment.[45] There were further changes among the Irish agents. Commander John L. R. Stoll was appointed to Sligo in succession to Capt. Willis, and Capt. de Courcy (Belfast) took the place of Capt. Friend who had retired from Queenstown after long and faithful service. This left the post at Belfast vacant; it was offered to Capt. William Rowlatt whose services as emigration agent at St. Helena had lately been discontinued in consequence of the cessation of the African slave trade. Pending return to the British Isles, Commander Peter B. Stewart was appointed temporarily.[46] Capt. FitzGerald resigned his post at Tarbert, and Lieut. R. D. Hay, R.N., took over both that port and Tralee.[47]

Most of the alterations in 1854, however, were caused by the Crimean War which called many of the naval officers back into service. Lieut. Luckraft, assistant officer at Liverpool, was the first to go, returning to active service as first lieutenant on H.M.S. *Euryalus;* Lieut. H. P. Nettleton, who was appointed his successor, did not remain long at his new post, for the war called him too back into service on H.M.S. *Mariner.* Commander Stewart, who had been acting emigration officer at Belfast, was moved to the vacant post at Liverpool. Meanwhile Mr. Wiggins, another of the assistants, had been posted to H.M.S. *Impregnable* and was succeeded by

[45]C.O. to Commrs., 10 January 1854. C.O. 384/90. Commrs. to Merivale, 4 April. C.O. 384/92. Evatt was to receive £200 from 31 January. There is nothing to indicate that an officer was appointed at Glasgow. Commrs. to Merivale, 28 December 1853. C.O. 384/90.

[46]Commrs. to Merivale, 4 and 10 April, 4 May and 8 September 1854. C.O. 384/92. Stoll was to receive £208. 5 from 24 January; de Courcy was appointed 3 April; Stewart and Rowlatt received the same salary (£208. 5). Rowlatt had been emigration officer at Waterford before becoming superintendent of liberated Africans at St. Helena; he arrived at Belfast early in July and Stewart went to Liverpool.

[47]These were both outposts of the chief station at Limerick; Hay received a salary of £100; appointed 6 August. Commrs. to Merivale, 19 August 1854. *Ibid.*

Commander George S. Dyer.[48] The London staff also was affected by the war. Mr. Ramsden and Lieut. Mann, assistant officers there, were called into service by the Admiralty; Mr. J. T. Forster was promoted to Ramsden's position, and Lieuts. E. Barnard and Thomas A. Aldridge were appointed to the vacant posts.[49] The office at Londonderry relinquished by Mr. Sutherland to go to H.M.S. *Powerful* was taken over by Capt. Charles Patey.[50] Finally the Admiralty took Lieut. Griffiths, the officer at Waterford and New Ross; his successor was Commander Augustus G. Burton, R.N. About the same time Capt. Keele, who had recently gone to Glasgow, got into difficulties with the shipping interests there, and the Emigration Commissioners deemed it best to have Capt. Patey return to his old post. Keele took Patey's place at Londonderry.[51]

In 1855 there were but four moves. Commander Burton left his new post at Waterford for a short time to return to active service, but was soon back at the Irish town.[52] When Lieut. Carew resigned from Plymouth, Capt. Patey was moved to the vacant post, and Capt. John J. B. E. Frere, R.N., was appointed to Glasgow.[53] After this general rearrangement of the agency

[48]Commrs. to Merivale, 10 February, 18 April, and 23 June 1854. *Ibid.*, and C.O. 386/118, p. 56. Nettleton was appointed 26 January, and Stewart 20 June.

[49]Commrs. to Merivale, 16 October 1854. C.O. 384/92. Forster was to receive £170 from 1 August, and Barnard £150 from 15 September.

[50]Patey had previously been at Glasgow and Liverpool (*vide supra*) but had left the latter place on being appointed to H.M.S. *Amphion;* he soon returned and on 16 May 1854 was appointed to Londonderry at the usual salary (£208. 5). Commrs. to Merivale, 14 July 1854. *Ibid.*

[51]Burton received £120; Keele and Patey £208. 5; the latter exchanged posts on October 1. Commrs. to Merivale, 16 October 1854. *Ibid.*

[52]Capt. Thomas E. L. Moore, R.N., acted during Burton's absence, 6 March—4 July. Commrs. to Merivale, 13 March and 18 July 1855. C.O. 384/94.

[53]Patey was appointed 6 June and Frere 29 June; salaries the same, £208. 5. Commrs. to Merivale, 11 June and 18 July 1855. The first of these letters is bound in the wrong volume—C.O. 384/96; the other is correctly bound in C.O. 384/94.

staff in the years between 1850 and 1855 there were fewer changes until the Emigration Board gave up its control of the corps.

This year 1855, which witnessed the passage of the great Passengers Act, also marked the peak in the development of the corps of emigration officers; thereafter the staff was slowly decreased. The first reduction came early in 1856. On the death of Commander Rowlatt at Belfast one of the assistants at Liverpool, Commander Dyer, was promoted and the position at Liverpool was left vacant.[54] The next year two offices were reduced. Ill health compelled the retirement of Commander Higgins, another of the Liverpool assistants; Lieut. Saunders was transferred to the vacancy from Galway, and as few ships were now sailing from that port no successor was appointed.[55] Then Capt. de Courcy resigned his office at Cork and Queenstown to take an appointment on H.M.S. *Pylades*. As the emigration from Dublin, like that from Galway, had almost entirely ceased, Capt. Kerr was transferred to Cork and the Dublin agency closed.[56] A few months later, early in 1858, a third Irish office was dropped for the same reason. Capt. Stoll was moved from Sligo to succeed Capt. Patey at Plymouth; Stoll's place was left vacant.[57] Mr. Sam Povey had the distinction of being the only detective employed by the Emigration Board. It was felt that such an officer

[54]Dyer was raised from £200 to £208. 5; thus £200 were saved. Commrs. to Merivale, 20 February 1856. C.O. 384/96.

[55]Saunders' salary was raised from £120 to £200, a further saving of £120. Murdoch to Merivale, 30 June 1857. C.O. 384/98.

[56]The salaries were the same, so £208. 5 were saved. Murdoch to Merivale, 4 August 1857. C.O. 384/99.—On 3 July 1857, during a debate on the emigration vote, Bristol was advocated as an emigration agency; no action was taken. *Hansard,* CXLVI. 909-912.

[57]Patey had been appointed Agent for Packets at Southampton; a further saving of £208. 5. Commrs. to Merivale, 13 January 1858. C.O. 386/118, pp. 428-429. See letter of Rogers to Capt. Rynasbon, R.N., 19 December 1857: "Our duties are contracting themselves and . . . we are obliged to take every opportunity which presents itself of reducing our appointments." C.O. 386/120, p. 206.

would be very useful at Liverpool in putting down frauds and in controlling "runners"; the sum of £114. 5 was accordingly added to the estimate for the experiment, and Povey was appointed (May 1858).[58]

The records for the years after 1858 are lacking except in one or two instances; from the Colonization Circulars, however, it is possible to reconstruct to some extent the changes in the emigration corps during the last years, 1859-1872 inclusive. Five offices were closed: Waterford (Commander Burton) in 1858, Tralee (Lieut. Hay) in 1859, Belfast (Capt. Dyer) in 1862, Limerick (Commander Ellis) in 1863, and Southampton (Mr. Smith) in 1865. The Liverpool office saw numerous changes; Capt. Schomberg was succeeded as chief officer in 1859 by his former assistant Commander Prior, who ten years later was in turn replaced by Admiral Kerr from Cork. It will be recalled that in 1852 the salaries of the chief officer and assistants at Liverpool had been temporarily increased by £50, subject to revision on new appointments if the emigration decreased. These extra payments continued until 1869 when the fall in emigration caused the Treasury to intimate that a reversion to the previous scale was in order. Kerr, therefore, was appointed chief officer at £350 and his juniors reduced to £150.[59] Among the assistants two left the Liverpool office—Commander Stewart (1859) and Lieut. Saunders (1866), and eight joined for long or short periods—Lieuts. Hay (1861) and Aldridge (1861-2), Mr. Roberts (1863-7), Lieut. Thompson (1864-7), Mr. Edwards (1864-73), Commanders Hoblyn (1867-73), St. Aubyn (1868-72), and Geary (1868-73). In 1868 Commander Lean ended his long years of service at London and was succeeded by his assistant Staff

[58]Commrs. to Merivale, 22 March and 25 May 1858. C.O. 386/118, pp. 446-448, 457-458.

[59]By 1871, however, the emigration and work had again increased to such an extent that the Commrs. twice recommended a return to the £400 and £200 salaries. Murdoch to Herbert, 9 November 1871 and 17 April 1872. C.O. 386/119, pp. 192-193, 215-216.

Commander Forster. Westbrook continued as one of the assistants there until 1872; in 1870 Capt. Barnard, another of the assistants, died and was succeeded by Lieut. Sconce of the Indian army.[60] Lieut. Aldridge left the London office in 1860 for Liverpool; a new assistant was not appointed until 1866 (Commander Standbridge). Other changes in the corps of officers were: Capt. Kerr, who had been appointed to Cork in 1857, was transferred to Liverpool in 1869 (an Admiral now), and was succeeded by Commander Gibbons. Capt. Frere served at Glasgow and Greenock from 1855 to 1860, Commander Stewart from 1861 to 1863, and Capt. Mackenzie from 1864 to 1872. At Londonderry Commander Keele served until 1863, and then retiring with the rank of Admiral was succeeded by Capt. Gough.

By 1872 the work of the Emigration Commission was drawing to a close, and other provision was being made for carrying on the duties it once performed. In accordance with the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1872, on January 1, 1873, "the surveying of ships for Emigration purposes and the staff of Emigration Officers" passed into the hands of the Board of Trade which thereafter supervised the establishments at the outports. "Economy as well as increased efficiency" were anticipated from this transfer.[61] The composition of the corps of emigration officers at that time was: Liverpool —Admiral Kerr, assistants Bourchier, Geary, St. Aubyn, Edwards, Hoblyn and Evatt; London—Staff Commdr. Forster, assistants Westbrook, Standbridge and Sconce; Plymouth—Capt. Stoll; Glasgow and Greenock—Capt. Mackenzie; Londonderry—Capt. Gough; and Cork—Commdr. Gibbons.[62] One of the first actions of the Board of Trade was to dispense with the services of Admiral Kerr and Capt.

[60]Murdoch to Rogers, 16 July 1870. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63. Sconce was appointed in March.

[61]Board of Trade to C.O., 9 November, and Kimberley to Treasury, 4 December 1872. C.O. 384/100.

[62]Colonization Circular No. 31.

Bourchier at Liverpool. This move aroused much opposition; the emigration firms of that city sent a memorial to the Board pointing out the long and valuable services of these officers and asking that the government adequately compensate them.[63] The two officers were thereupon recommended for pensions.[64] Capt. Westbrook, assistant officer at London, also was dismissed and applied for a pension. After some haggling the Treasury awarded Kerr £180.16. 8, Bourchier £125, and Westbrook £100 a year as pension.[65]

The Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners had been served by an able and efficient corps of emigration officers. During the thirty-three years of their supervision (1840-1872) only two officers were found derelict in their duties; complaints of a serious nature were very few. On the other hand there were many tributes to the value of their work. For instance, on one occasion Sir John Pakington, the Colonial Secretary, informed the House of Commons that "he was told that in point of fact captains of ships had never had occasion to complain of the emigration officers, who were generally very competent persons."[66] In 1866 when there was an epidemic of cholera in emigrant ships, Mr. Adderley, the Colonial Under-Secretary, assured the Commons that no blame could attach to the emigration agents; the provisions of the Passengers Act had been strictly carried out in every instance. The Liverpool agency, he declared, was remarkably good; the senior officer

[63]The memorial, dated 15 November 1872, bore many signatures; the Board of Trade referred it to the Colonial Secretary. C.O. 384/100.

[64]C.O. 386/119, p. 280.

[65]Treasury letters of 8 April, 4 July, and 14 August 1873. C.O. 384/100 and 101. The emigration corps in 1873 was as follows: Liverpool—Capt. Mackenzie (replacing Kerr), assistants Geary, Edwards, Hoblyn, Evatt, and Burgess (replacing Bourchier; St. Aubyn was not replaced); London—Forster and Sconce (Westbrook and Standbridge not replaced); Greenock—Commander Cressy and Mr. Fred Harris (replacing Mackenzie); Plymouth, Londonderry and Cork were unchanged; a new post was added at Cardiff—Messrs. W. H. Neate and H. A. Hearn. Colonization Circular No. 32.

[66]April 19, 1852. *Hansard,* CXX. 870.

had been thirty years in the service and not one complaint had been made against him; his assistant had served sixteen years without complaints. Mr. Alderman Lusk also testified to the excellent management of the Commissioners, they deserved commendation.[67]

Some of the emigration officers spent decades in the service. Capt. Lean was the dean of the corps and an officer of the highest caliber. In 1837 he had been appointed emigration officer at London and remained there until 1868—over thirty years of unbroken service. In 1851 it was said of him: " . . . the services which Lieut. Lean has had an opportunity of rendering . . . have been far more extensive and arduous than those of any other officer in the same department, and . . . Lord Grey feels reason to be greatly indebted to him for the uniform discretion which he has shown in the great variety of exigencies which have occurred in the course of experience at such a post."[68] Fifteen years later he was commended in parliament by Mr. Alderman Lusk who said he had "known for twenty-five years Captain Lean, . . . [and] could testify that he was a conscientious and faithful officer, and that he troubled shipowners by being rather too particular."[69] Another officer of long service was Lieut. Henry. First appointed to Bristol in 1834, he had moved to Liverpool in 1840, and five years later because of ill health asked for transfer to Dublin where he remained until his retirement in 1852. The Commissioners expressed their entire satisfaction with his work and bore testimony to his "zeal, integrity and sound dis-

[67]July 27, 1866. *Ibid.*, CLXXXIV. 1618-1625. Prior and Bourchier are the officers referred to. Contemporary literature, as emigrant guide-books, contains frequent references to the zeal and efficiency of the emigration officers. See also *infra*, Chapter XI.

[68]C.O. to Admiralty, 13 June 1851. C.O. 384/86. Shortly afterwards Lieut. Lean was promoted to the rank of Captain.

[69]May 10, 1866. *Hansard*, CLXXXIII. 730.

cretion."[70] John Stoll prior to becoming an emigration officer had been engaged in the naval force suppressing the slave trade. In January 1854 he was appointed agent at Sligo, and four years later was transferred to Plymouth where he served for seventeen years until January 1876.[71] Other officers of long service were Friend (1834-54), Hodder (1834-51), Forrest (1834-50), Lynch (1834-50), Shuttleworth (1835-50), Ramsay (1838-50), Starke (1839-52), Prior (1851-68), Kerr (1852-72), Bourchier (1853-72), and Westbrook (1853-72); Forster appointed in 1853 was still in service in 1873. The emigration officers were indeed a credit to the profession to which they belonged.

[70]Commrs. to Elliot, 31 October 1851. C.O. 384/86. In support of Henry's application to the Admiralty for promotion to the rank of Commander on the reserved list.

[71]John Luke Richard Stoll was born at the Cape; he died 24 January 1877. Press clipping of 25 January 1877 in C.O. 386/2.

VII

GENERAL EMIGRATION

ALL emigration from the British Isles in the period 1840-1872 passed under the supervision of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners and their emigration officers stationed at the various outports of the United Kingdom. In the seaports these agents were able to afford to those preparing to embark sound advice and some degree of protection against fraud and imposition. Through the Passengers Acts, drafted to a large extent by the Commissioners and enforced through their emigration officers, the Board sought to regulate conditions on board emigrant vessels during the voyage. And finally, by its extensive correspondence with the colonial agents, the Board was able to keep itself, and the government, informed as to the condition on arrival and final disposition of those emigrants who proceeded to other parts of the empire. Upon all phases of the outward movement the Emigration Board reported at regular intervals, making comments and offering suggestions.

At the time the Commission was established the emigration from the British Isles had fully recovered from the check given it in 1838 by the troubles in Canada, and was growing to a volume greater than ever before. In 1842 a new record was set with 128,344 emigrants, but in the following year there was a marked decline of over 50 per cent. (57,212). Early in the season the Commissioners wrote: "It would be difficult to assign any cause which would adequately account for so great a falling off; but it would seem partly ascribable to the depression existing in several of the colonies; and which has doubtless deterred many from emigrating until better accounts should be received; and in the case of the Australian colonies, to the want of any public funds applicable to emigration, the voyage being too expensive to be defrayed by the class of people to

which the emigrants chiefly belong."[1] In order to secure all possible data upon the matter the Commissioners circularized the emigration officers for any information they could give. The agents attributed the decrease mainly to the unfavorable reports of the demand for labor in the United States and British North America, and to political excitement in Ireland. As minor causes they suggested the improved demand for labor in the north of England, and the prospects of railroad building in Ireland. At the same time in parts of Scotland and the neighboring islands people were so distressed they did not possess enough money to be able to emigrate.[2] This temporary depression in emigration soon ended; in 1844 the figures rose to 70,686, an increase of about 25 per cent.; and in 1845 a further increase of 32 per cent. brought the total to 93,501.[3] The tide continued to rise; 129,851 left the United Kingdom in 1846, an increase of 39 per cent. over the previous year and greater even than 1842. A "remarkable feature" of this year's emigration was the passage of 4361 Germans from London to the United States.[4] This was an "entirely new occurrence," but in the years to follow the proportion of foreigners coming to English ports to take ship for the new world increased steadily; in 1847, for instance, 10,318 foreigners sailed from London.

The one great cause for the rising volume of emigration after 1845 was the fact that in Ireland conditions were rapidly becoming worse and worse. For several successive seasons the potato crops failed, and the people faced with the threat of famine, if not actual famine conditions, hastened to leave their old homes to seek a new one in the reputed lands of plenty. Early in 1847 this exodus began to assume alarming propor-

[1]Report 1843, pp. 30-31.

[2]Report 1844, pp. 16-17.

[3]Reports 5, pp. 21-22; 6, pp. 31-32.

[4]"Lieut. Lean [the officer at London] very properly spared no effort to afford these foreigners his protection, and to do them all the good offices in his power." Report 7, pp. 8-11.

tions; by April it was "proceeding at a rate never witnessed before." Fever soon broke out among the starving multitudes who crowded the outports of the British Isles; the first reports of the disease were received on April 19, and by the first of June it had spread in a terrifying manner. The pressure for shipping became very great and passage rates inevitably rose. The total emigration for the year (1847) reached the astounding figure of 258,270, an increase of 99 per cent. over the preceding year! For the next seven years the flood remained at the same high level and even surpassed it. These were trying months for the Emigration Board and its officers and for the government as a whole. Everywhere it was being urgently pressed to increase still further the flow of emigration by applying to parliament for a grant of money.[5] A large, a cautious (!), and a wise system of colonization, it was declared, was the only possible solution to the difficulties of Ireland. But, answered the ministers, why should the government go to this tremendous expense? Emigration from Ireland was, and had been, flowing in great volume, and at practically *no* expense to the public revenue! Every year, as the Emigration Commissioners pointed out in their Reports, great sums of money were sent home by those who had emigrated in earlier years, and these voluntary remittances were amply sufficient to bear the cost of the greater part of the exodus from Ireland. "Emigration begets emigration." Why then should the government interfere with a voluntary, spontaneous emigration that was already quite satisfactory?[6] During these critical years, therefore, the government supervised and to some extent regulated, through the Passengers Act, the mad outward rush,

[5]*Vide supra* pp. 134ff; also *Hansard,* XCII. 1369-1450; XCIII. 471, 96-120; and P.P. ♯46 (1848). A Select Committee on Colonization from Ireland was appointed in the House of Lords in 1848.

[6]Grey, I. 239-245. He referred to the great numbers of emigrants going to the United States; but in augumenting the wealth of that nation they were really promoting British trade and prosperity. Canada, he claimed, had in proportion to population and means of employment received as many, if not more than the United States.

but refused to actively intervene to stimulate or retard the movement; it did not select emigrants for free passages, but on the other hand it placed no obstacles in their way.

In 1848 the emigration was slightly less (248,089) than in the year previous, and the mortality also, fortunately, was lower. The greatly improved health was partly due, it would seem, to the new Passengers Act with its improved regulations concerning ventilation, cooking and diet. Most of this year's emigration was directed to the United States; in fact there was a decrease in the proportion going to the St. Lawrence ports.[7] The opening of the season in 1849 indicated another record year, the first four months showing an increase of 15 per cent. over 1847 and 40 per cent. over 1848. The final total for the year did set a record—299,498, 20 per cent. higher than 1848 and over 40,000 above 1847. Once again the great majority—219,450 or over 73 per cent.—went to the United States. In the last two years a great change had been noticeable in the proportion going to the republic. One explanation lay in the fact that shipping to the port of New York offered greater facilities, superior accommodations and a shorter voyage.[8] The States too offered better internal communications—a matter of great advantage to the emigrants; to counteract this, however, emphasis was laid upon the great advantages to be found in proceeding to the western states through the Canadian canals. The increase in the Canadian emigrant tax in 1848 was also charged with driving many away from those provinces, until in 1849 the act was repealed and attempts were made to regain the lost volume of immigration. But the fundamental reason

[7]Although the Irish were said to be of a better class this year, the great mass of those reaching New York and Quebec were in poverty—as usual. Report 9, pp. 1ff. From 1848 on the Commissioners reported monthly to the Secretary of State giving statistics of the emigration from the various ports, with comments when necessary, and comparing the figures with those of previous years (beginning with 1847). C.O. 384/82.

[8]There was little difference in the rates: Liverpool to Quebec £3. 5, to New York £3.10. There were more steam packet lines to the latter port.

for the decrease was the inability of British North America to absorb the increased numbers who were coming to the new world. As a remedy for the small labor demand and as an encouragement to immigration, it was suggested that great public works be undertaken. Any such project on a large scale, however, could not be financed by the colonial treasury; why should the British government do so when the United States afforded ample field for employment?[9]

At the same time the government was again being urged to further accelerate the emigration of the destitute classes by grants from the imperial treasury. The Commissioners took the opportunity to sum up their views on the matter, based upon ten years' experience. In 1849 a total of approximately £1,090,000 was spent on emigration to North America; *all* of it came from private resources, and half (£540,000), it was estimated, had been sent from America to the United Kingdom. "It seems scarcely possible to doubt that a grant of money from the Imperial Treasury would very much interfere with this [voluntary] outlay." And if the treasury did intervene, "the continual attempts at fraud on the emigration agent at Quebec, by persons applying as paupers for assistance up the country, afford little encouragement for assuming that none but the really destitute would throw themselves on the Government grant." To all suggestions of imperial aid there was the one reply: "It would kill private initiative." Well, suppose then that government paid only half of the actual passage cost. With such a scheme an annual grant of £375,000 would only keep emigration at the same level and might even deter it.[10] "No machinery could be devised by which a judicious and trustworthy application of such a grant could be ensured." A central board would lack the necessary local knowledge; a

[9]Taking 7000 immigrant workers as the basis, the project for public works would cost £280,000 annually for wages alone. On the emigration of 1849 see Reports 9, pp. 47-48; 10, pp. 1-19.

[10]It was estimated that passages to America in 1849 cost £750,000.

local board would be subject to interested pressure of every kind. And even if the parliamentary grant could be applied in good faith to those who could not otherwise emigrate, "it is not certain that the result would be a desirable one."

The complaints, so frequently made, when only private funds have been used to promote emigration, of the class of persons sent out, would be renewed with more force, and greater reason, against a more extensive and a Government measure—and probably both the United States and Canada would re-enact the stringent laws which they adopted against indiscriminate emigration in 1848. The cause of emigration generally would be damaged; and even if a temporary advantage were gained, it would be gained at the sacrifice of a permanent interest.

But there was quite another angle to the problem. Was an *increase* of emigration really *necessary?* During the years 1848-1849 the average annual exodus had been not far short of the annual increase in the United Kingdom. From Ireland, the field of most of the colonization proposals, the average emigration was about 200,500;[11] the increase of population was 88,435! Should this *decrease* of population be accelerated? These arguments, of course, applied to emigration in general, but they were also true for assistance given to some special locality. Legislation had provided a remedy for any distressed district, but it was a "matter of regret, that, in districts where labour is in excess, the powers contained in the Poor Law Act for raising funds for emigration purposes are so little resorted to." Such was the Commissioners' case against government assistance in general or in particular.[12]

After a slight decrease in 1850 (280,849),[13] a new record was set in 1851, to be surpassed again by the great migration

[11]National origin of emigrants was not as yet determined annually; but at a low estimate 9/10 of those sailing from Liverpool were Irish, plus, of course, those from Irish ports.

[12]Report 10, pp. 6-9.

[13]At least 207,852 of these were Irish, and of a better class than in former years. The proportion of emigrants going to the United States again showed an increase, while that to British North America and Australasia declined. The figures were: U.S.A. 223,078—79.43% (1849—73.27%);

of the following year. Of the 335,966 who left the United Kingdom in 1851 about 257,372 were Irish, which led the Commissioners to observe that "the annual decrease of the population in Ireland is not less than the annual amount of the emigration, and . . . unless the emigration be soon arrested, the country will be deserted by its original population." They also commented again upon the increasing preference of emigrants for the American republic. "Up to 1835 the emigration to British North America generally exceeded that to the United States. Between 1835 and 1847 the emigration to the United States exceeded every year that to British North America,—but the disproportion was not very great, never, except in 1838 and 1839, amounting to 2 to 1; but in the four years between 1848 and the close of 1851 the disproportion has been excessive," about 6 to 1.[14] The emigration in the following year (1852) presented several unusual features. It set a record which was never surpassed—368,764, 10 per cent. higher than the previous year. For the first time since the Commission was established the emigration to Australasia exceeded that to British North America, and not until 1867 did the Canadas regain the lead; the explanation of this great change lay in two words—gold rush. Another circumstance of peculiar interest was the rather marked decrease, absolutely and relatively, in the number of Irish emigrants, 224,997 or

B.N.A. 32,961—11.74% (13.81%); A.&N.Z. 16,037—5.71% (10.75%); others 8,773—3.12% (2.17%). The sum sent home from America was estimated at £957,000. It might be noted that every Report from 1847 onwards contained statistics upon this point. Report 11, pp. 1-2; appendices 1-3.

[14]The figures for 1851 were: U.S.A. 267,357; B.N.A. 42,605; A.&N.Z. 21,532; others 4472. The disproportion appeared to the Commissioners to be "traceable to a few simple causes"—those that had been indicated some years previously. First, no more than 35,000 to 40,000 were needed in ordinary years to supply the labor market in the Canadas and New Brunswick. Second, the increase and uncertainty of the Canadian emigrant tax after 1847. Third, the prepaid passages sent home from the U.S.A. Fourth, to prevent disproportion the government would have to afford employment at enormous expense. And fifth, the cost of passage deterred unassisted emigration to Australasia. Report 12, pp. 9-15; appendices 1-4.

61 per cent. of the total; this, of course, was a rather inevitable result of the enormous drainage of the previous years.[15] It might be pointed out in this connection that beginning with April of this year (1852) the monthly statistical returns of the Commissioners, sent to the Colonial Office, bear this note: "N. B. This Return can only distinguish Emigrants according to the Ports from which they sail. If it is wished to ascertain the total of Irish Emigrants, at least 9/10ths of the Emigration from Liverpool must be added to the numbers which sail from Ireland."[16] The work of the Emigration Board during this record season did not go unrecognized. Newcastle, the Colonial Secretary, wrote that he had "much satisfaction in placing on record his sense of the credit which he considers due to the Board for the success with which they met the difficulties and unprecedented demands of the past year."[17]

After this high tide the flood of emigration receded, slowly at first, then rapidly. The great emigration period was coming to an end, and as it did a change became noticeable in the character of the outward movement.

> In those previous years [before 1847] the amount [of emigration] seems to have depended more immediately on the momentary circumstances of the labouring classes than since, and it accordingly rose and fell in pretty exact accordance with the greater or less pressure on those classes. In effect, the labouring classes were in former years driven to emigrate only by the presence or the immediate fear of destitution; they are now induced to do so by the hope also of advancement.

Another new feature in the emigration after 1847 was the great amount of money remitted annually from North America and directed principally to Ireland. In fact the emigration from that island was now carried on chiefly by means of these remittances.[18] The proportion of Irish, however, continued to

[15]U.S.A. 244,261; B.N.A. 32,873; A.&N.Z. 87,881; others 3749. The sum sent home this year also set a record, £1,404,000. Report 13, pp. 9-13.

[16]C.O. 384/89.

[17]C.O. to Commrs., 20 January 1853. C.O. 384/90.

[18]The remittances for 1853 surpassed those of the previous year—£1,439,000. The Commissioners published regulations for a remittance scheme

decrease; in 1853 the total (199,392) was numerically less than for any year since 1848 and proportionately showed an even greater decline. The year's total emigration amounted to 329,937; both Australasia and the United States showed a falling-off, while British North America increased.[19] Large numbers of Germans were once again sailing from British ports.

Late in 1853 cholera appeared in emigrant ships, considerably increasing the mortality and forcing the authorities to take extra precautions. When fever was first reported at Cork and Belfast, the Board immediately proposed issuing a notice to warn people and to discourage emigrants who were susceptible to cholera. Newcastle sanctioned the notice, adding that possible complaints of shipowners must not be considered when so many lives were at stake. The notice was thereupon issued, warning prospective emigrants of the danger and suggesting precautions to be taken.[20] As a further check upon the ravages of the disease the Board wished to secure the assistance of the American authorities. They pointed out how important it was to obtain as much information as possible concerning the healthiness of voyages to the United States; for this the help of the local authorities in foreign ports was necessary so that

whereby settlers in the colonies could send money home to relatives. The settler deposited the sum with the chief agent (in Canada), receiving a certificate which he sent to the relative or friend; this certificate could be applied to passage on vessels from any port in the United Kingdom or from Bremen and Hamburg to a colonial port. In Upper Canada the sum of 2/6 was charged for each certificate under £10, and 5/- for sums over that figure. (See Traill, *Canadian Settler's Guide,* appendix 8.)

[19]The numbers were U.S.A. 230,885; B.N.A. 34,522; A.&N.Z. 61,401; others 3,129. Report 14, pp. 9-22; appendices 1-5, 21-24.

[20]Commrs. to Merivale, 10 November 1853. C.O. 384/90. A printed copy of the notice is in C.O. 384/92. See also Traill, *Female Emigrant's Guide,* p. 43. "The many fatal cases of cholera . . . will impress upon all who contemplate emigrating the propriety of adopting the salutary precautions set down by orders of her Majesty's Land and Emigration Commissioners, and widely circulated by placard."

the passenger lists could be checked with the passengers landed and the number of deaths accurately ascertained. The Board accordingly suggested to Newcastle that steps might be taken by the proper authorities to secure this co-operation.[21] In the following spring J. O'Connell moved for the appointment of a select committee of the Commons to inquire into the causes of the fearful loss of life on emigrant ships during the epidemic. Mr. Peel, Parliamentary Under-Secretary, in a lengthy reply defended the Board against blame and claimed they had worked faithfully, to which O'Connell hastened to reply that he made no imputations on the conduct of the Commissioners.[22] The effects of the fever were still noticeable in 1854, and that year was also unfortunate in having more shipwrecks than usual.

A small decrease in emigration in 1854 was followed by a remarkable drop of almost 50 per cent. in 1855.[23] It was again in the number of Irish that the reduction was most marked; in 1855 they totalled no more than 78,854, not quite 45 per cent. of the total. This was attributable to several factors. The most important, the Commissioners believed, were the diminution of the population of Ireland and the improved position of the laboring classes with rising wages. In addition there were the decreased employment in the United States because of the crisis there; the activities of the "Know-Nothing" party and its opposition to the Irish and Roman Catholics;

[21]Commrs. to Merivale, 23 December 1853. C.O. 386/117, pp. 328-330. See also *supra* p. 145.

[22]The motion was agreed to, 2 March 1854. *Hansard,* CXXXI. 203-223. See also Commrs. to Merivale, 22 March 1855. C.O. 384/94.

[23]1854: 323,429; 1855: 176,807. In 1848 the Commissioners had begun the practice of sending to the Colonial Office monthly statistical comparative returns of emigration. These reports were circulated among the members of the cabinet for their information, but after a time only the quarterly returns (which were summarized) were circulated. In January 1854 Newcastle, acting on Elliot's suggestion, directed that henceforth comparative returns be furnished at the end of the quarter only, and that the practice of circulation be given up. C.O. 384/92.

and the demands for soldiers and sailors because of the Crimean War. The Australian gold rush which had continued through 1854 also began to fall off in 1855.[24] There was no change in the volume of emigration in 1856 (176,554), but the Commissioners were now of the opinion that it was the demand occasioned by the Crimean War in all departments connected with the army and navy which was keeping emigration to this low level.[25] With the cessation of hostilities it was to be expected that the outward flow of population would increase; but almost immediately afterwards the Indian mutiny broke out and once again there was a call for troops. As recruiting for the army in India did not begin, however, until rather late in 1857, the deterrent effect upon that year's emigration was only partial and the total actually showed an increase—212,875. The voyages that year were on the whole very healthy, due partly to the improved accommodations and dietary scale in use under the new Passengers Act, but mainly due to the absence of epidemic disease at the ports of embarkation. Shipwrecks which had rather marred the emigration of previous years were absent in 1857. One very unusual feature of interest in this year's emigration was the return to the United Kingdom of 18,839 persons, due largely to the commercial crisis in the United States. The proportion of Irish

[24]The emigration for 1854 and 1855 was divided as follows: U.S.A. 193,065; 103,414; B.N.A. 43,761; 17,966; A.&N.Z. 83,237; 52,309; others 3366; 3118. In 1855 the temporary swing to Canada in preference to the United States ended and the Commissioners again began to give explanations for the disproportion. The mortality in 1855 was low, but the year was marred by the first loss of one of the Board's chartered ships. Reports 15, pp. 9-16, appendices 1-5; 16, pp. 9-16, appendices 1-6. With Report 15 the Commissioners began the practice of adding as a concluding paragraph a few words on the prospects of the next season's emigration; see *op. cit.*, p. 54.

[25]This factor, they believed, was more important than the abundance of employment. As in the previous year the mortality was low; the emigrants on the whole were of a better class. Shipwrecks were again rather numerous. U.S.A. 111,837; B.N.A. 16,378; A.&N.Z. 44,584; others 3755. Report 17, pp. 9-13, appendices 1-6.

emigrants, which had been steadily declining since 1851 (75.76 per cent.), was now but 40.51 per cent.[26]

The effect of the demand for recruits for India was fully evident in the emigration of 1858 and 1859. Coupled with this were economic factors; in the United States and British North America a commercial crisis had begun in the autumn of 1857, followed a few months later by a period of distress in Australia.[27] "A more satisfactory and permanent cause of decrease," however, was the altered condition of Ireland's population—"the increased prosperity of the working classes in Ireland, and the consequent absence of any inducement to emigrate." All of these factors combined to reduce the emigration once again to 113,972 and 120,432 with the Irish forming 38 per cent. and 43.95 per cent.[28] The health of the emigrants continued to be good; there were four shipwrecks, but only two attended with loss of life.[29] With the cessation of the Australian gold rush the emigration to those colonies showed a marked decline, the lowest since 1851.[30] In 1860 the exodus from the United Kingdom showed a slight increase

[26]The great bulk of the Irish continued to go to the United States, their expenses being paid by the large sums of money sent home. The total emigration 1815-1857, the Commissioners noted, was 4,683,194. Report 18, pp. 11ff.

[27]In addition to those mentioned above as returning from the U.S.A., 4863 came back to the United Kingdom from Australasia.

[28]Ireland's improved condition was due in part to the great sums sent home by her sons overseas, sums far more than required to defray the expenses of all the Irish emigration. For example, in 1858 the amount sent home totalled £472,610; the Irish emigration could have cost no more than about £200,000. In 1859 the sum remitted was £621,176, of which £45,798 came from Australia and the remainder from America.

[29]The mortality to America was the lowest since 1854 (0.19%). The *Austria* was lost in 1858 with 492 lives, and the *Pomona* in the following year with 417. *The Eastern City* was shipwrecked in 1858 without loss of life; the gallantry of her commander was rewarded with a chronometer presented by Bulwer-Lytton, the Colonial Secretary.

[30]For these two years (1858-9) see Reports 18, p. 59; 19, pp. 11-18 and 57; and 20, pp. 13-20. Rumors of war and actual war upon the continent affected foreign emigration through Great Britain in the years 1857-1860.

to 128,469. The most remarkable feature of this year's emigration was a great increase in the number of Irish, 60,835 or over 47 per cent.[31]

The emigration of 1852 had set the high record, that of 1861 marked the lowest point since 1844; in fact during the lifetime of the Commission only three years (1840, 1843, 1844) saw a smaller exodus. Of the 91,770 who left the United Kingdom in 1861 the American Union received about one-half, 49,764, Australasia 23,758, and British North America 12,707. The decline in the American and increase in the Canadian proportions was very marked. Although the Irish decline was numerically very striking (36,322 as against 60,835 in 1860), the proportionate decrease was by no means so great—the proportion being just under 40 per cent. The small emigration that year was, of course, to be attributed to the outbreak of the Civil War in America, and also partially to the depletion of Ireland. It was satisfactory to note that the voyages continued to be healthy and free from shipwreck.[32] There was a marked recovery in the emigration for 1862, although the Civil War continued to divert emigrants from that land. British North America profited to some extent; but it was Australia which accounted for the increase in the year's total, of which it received 34.51 per cent. "The increase in Australian emigration is to be attributed, no doubt, to the facilities offered by the several colonies to persons already settled there to send home for their relations and friends." A rise in the number of Irish emigrants was taken to indicate

[31]During the first quarter of the year the Irish made up 51.81% of the total. "The cause of this increase . . . we are at present unable to explain." Reports 20, pp. 55-56; 21, pp. 11-13.

[32]The mortality to America was about 0.045%. Remittances from America this year were £426,285. Report 22, pp. 11-13. This Report is unusual in that the prospects for 1862 are not referred to. Mention is, however, made of the return of 32,003 emigrants to the United Kingdom in 1861, 26,487 of them from America. *Ibid.*, p. 62.

"an increase of pressure upon the labouring class in Ireland";[33] but when the number increased still further in the following years another explanation was offered by some people. Charges were made in the press and more than once in parliament[34] that the large bounties offered to recruits in the Union army were enticing young Irishmen there to be "murdered." The Commissioners took great pains to investigate the situation and repeatedly refuted these charges. Statistics showed that the emigration of Irish in 1863 was less in proportion to the population of Ireland than the emigration of any of the years 1847 to 1854 inclusive. Furthermore, the proportion of single men, who would be the ones attracted to the army, was not larger than in previous years. For instance, in 1859 the percentage of single Irishmen proceeding to the United States was 37.6 of the total Irish emigration thither; in 1860 it was 38.0, in 1862 33.6 and in 1863 38.1. "Of those who went out many, no doubt, enlisted; but their number could have had but little effect in keeping up the strength of the Federal armies . . . The high rate of wages in private employ may reasonably be expected to have outweighed, in many cases, the temptation of the bounty." The Commissioners came to the conclusion that "the largeness of the emigration from Ireland [was] no doubt to be attributed to the distress." Nevertheless to satisfy any doubts on the matter, and to put the Irish on their guard, a notice was issued by the Commissioners in August 1864 and, with the assistance of the police, was posted up far and wide in Ireland, as well as at the prin-

[33]The Irish numbered 49,680, numerically more but proportionately about the same as the previous year. Distribution in 1862: U.S.A. 58,706; B.N.A. 15,522; A.&N.Z. 41,843; others 5,143. Mortality as usual was low. Report 23, pp. 11-12.

[34]For instance, on 28 July 1864 Lord Edward Howard in a long speech to the House of Commons moved for papers on emigration to the United States; he charged that emigrants were being enticed to the States for army service. Several others spoke and the motion was agreed to. *Hansard*, CLXXVI. 2161-2182.

cipal ports in England. "We also altered to the same effect the cautionary ticket, which for many years we have been in the habit of issuing through our officers at the out-ports to emigrants proceeding to the United States, to put them on their guard against 'Runners' in New York, and some other of the principal sea-ports."[35]

By 1863 the emigration slump was over, and the tide was flowing again as it had in years gone by; 223,758 left their native shores for the new lands across the seas. The United States, with 65.61 per cent. of the emigrants, had come back into her own; the Irish too were again on the upward trend.[36] Another significant feature of this year's, and subsequent, emigration was an increased use of British vessels, particularly steamships from Liverpool and the Clyde. In 1862 81.33 per cent. of the emigrants leaving Liverpool for the United States had sailed in American ships (the ratio had been the same for the preceding decade), but the very next year (1863) 46 per cent. sailed in British bottoms. The day of the American clipper was passing! "The advantage of this change, not only in the shortening of the voyage (through the use of steamers), but in the greater protection afforded to the emigrant, is sufficiently obvious." The change also indicated that the class of emigrants was improving; they could pay the higher rates. Although the mortality this year was small, it had been somewhat increased by unfortunate casualties at sea; one vessel was burnt with over 300 on board, and other wrecks occurred with loss of life.[37] The emigration for the following year (1864) presented no unusual feature other than this, of the emigrants proceeding to North America 85,555 were conveyed by steam

[35]Reports 24, pp. 14-15; 25, pp. 11-14, and appendix 51.

[36]English 27.37%; Scotch 6.81; Irish 52.02; foreigners 3.50; and not distinguished 10.30. U.S.A. 146,813 (65.61%); A.&N.Z. 53,054 (23.71); B.N.A. 18,083 (8.08); others 5808 (2.60). Report 24, pp. 11ff. Future prospects are still omitted from the Reports.

[37]*Ibid.*

and 74,208 by sail.[38] The significance of this will presently be evident.

The emigration of 1865 and 1866 met with misfortunes.[39] In January and February of 1866 there were many shipwrecks; but the greatest misfortune was the re-appearance, late in 1865, of cholera, first in Cork and then in Liverpool. As the foreign emigrants seemed to be particularly susceptible to the disease, the Commissioners warned shipowners against taking Dutch or German passengers. They also prepared an order-in-council, issued 9 August 1866, requiring a medical man on all ships carrying as many as fifty passengers, and established a hospital ship at Cork.[40] The volume of emigration had been steadily contracting since 1863; in 1867 a new low was reached with 195,953, a figure which was hardly exceeded in the following season (196,325).

A critical examination of the movement from the British Isles in this later period reveals some interesting points. In 1863 45.85 per cent. of the emigrants to North America were conveyed in steam vessels; the following year the proportion was slightly increased to 53.55. At this point a remarkable expansion began: 1865—73.50 per cent.; 1866—81.16; 1867—93; 1868—93.16; 1869—95.27; 1870—95.77; 1871—96.28 and 1872—98.04 per cent. In eight years the sailing vessel had practically vanished from the North American passenger trade! As the cost of steam passages was 30 per cent. to 50 per cent. higher than sail this change indicated that emigrants were no longer of the destitute class. Another point to note is

[38]U.S.A. 147,042; B.N.A. 12,721; A.&N.Z. 40,942; others 8195; total emigration 208,900. English 56,618; Irish 115,428; Scotch 15,035; foreigners 16,942; not distinguished 4877. Report 25, pp. 11-15.

[39]The statistics for these years are: total emigration 209,801; 204,882. U.S.A. 147,258; 161,000. B.N.A. 17,211; 13,255. A.&N.Z. 37,283; 24,097. Others 8049; 6530. English 61,345; 58,856. Scotch 12,870; 12,307. Irish 100,676; 98,890. Foreigners 28,619; 26,691. Not distinguished (principally cabin passengers) 6291; 8138. Reports 26, pp. 11-17; 27, pp. 1-11.

[40]The *Inconstant* used as a hospital ship there during the cholera epidemic of 1854 had been given up in 1861. *Vide supra.*

that after 1866 the Irish steadily decreased, while the English (after 1868) and foreigners rapidly increased in numbers. Since 1863 indeed the real emigration from the United Kingdom had been falling off, and its apparent magnitude had been kept up by the great increase in the number of foreigners who emigrated through British ports. While in 1863 they were but 3 per cent. of the whole emigration, in 1868 they were 26 per cent. and remained about the same proportion down to the end of the period under review (1872). They were Nordics, Germans, Swedes and Danes, brought to Hull by boat and thence by railroad to Liverpool from which port they sailed to America. To prevent frauds practiced on these foreigners a notice printed in English, French, German and Swedish was distributed in British ports and on the continent.[41] As the foreigners grew in numbers the Irish decreased; in 1863 they had made up 60 per cent. of the total exodus, but in 1868 they were only 47 per cent. In 1869 for the first time since there were any trustworthy returns the number of English emigrants exceeded the Irish, 90,416 to 73,325. This was due to the gradual improvement of conditions in Ireland, and also, no doubt, to the high hopes entertained for the Irish Land Bill. The increase of the English emigration from 1869 on was due in part to distress, particularly in London,[42] and even more, perhaps, "to the benevolent exertions of the several societies and associations which in the course of the last few years have undertaken to assist the emigration of deserving persons of the labouring class."[43] At this time it was again urged in the House of Commons that the treasury assist emigration. "The proposition was resisted on the ground that such a grant would put an end to the contributions from private sources by which emigration is now carried on; that it would impose on the class who pay taxes an unnecessary

[41]Notice dated 29 April 1867. See Report 27, appendix 42.
[42]Report 30, pp. 4-11.
[43]Report 31, p. 2.

burden; that the better class of labourers would not emigrate; while a pauper emigration would be refused by both the colonies and the United States." The Commissioners were repeating the arguments of 1847.[44]

After the contraction of 1867-8 emigration again expanded and during the last four years of the Emigration Board's supervision averaged about 260,000 per annum. The distribution of the emigrants remained about the same, the United States attracting the great majority, some 200,000. Canada after 1866 again exceeded the Australasian colonies, which in 1871 reached the lowest point since 1847; the new Dominion drew 35,000 annually to 15,000 for the others. In 1870-1 the Franco-Prussian War had a temporary influence upon the foreign emigration through the British Isles, but in 1872 it was back to the former level.[45] The emigration to "other places" in 1872 was much larger than usual; about one-half (6,411 out of 13,385) was directed to Central and South America. For many years the governments of South America had been making great exertions to stimulate immigration from Europe, and during the last three years had been attempting to draw emigrants from the United Kingdom. Convinced that

[44]The Board considered the question at length. Emigration to North America, which alone was actually "relief" emigration, had cost £650,000 per annum since 1847, all privately paid. If parliament had paid for it the money would have been wasted. Americans and Canadians did not welcome pauper emigration; American law, in fact, barred "public paupers." Government colonization in Canada was impracticable. Only a fifth or sixth of her immigrants remained there; the Dominion was but "the highway between Europe and Western America." Its government, too, was looking after its own immigration and had in the last two years (*i. e.* since Confederation) appointed agents at London, Dublin, Glasgow, Belfast and Antwerp. What was there for the imperial government to do? Loans to emigrants the Commissioners also regarded as impracticable; the sums would never be repaid. Report 30, pp. 4-11.

[45]A great decrease in the number of foreigners in 1870 was generally attributed to the War, but the Commissioners pointed out that the decrease occurred in the six months *before* the War began. No other explanation was offered. Reports 31, p. 1; 32, p. 1.

the governments were following the wrong policy, the Commissioners issued warnings that Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil and the Argentine were unsuitable for English settlers.[46]

The Commissioners' remarks in their Thirtieth Report upon the question of government assistance to emigration were prompted by a debate which had occurred in parliament on the subject, the last extended debate during this period. Mr. R. Torrens proposed the motion "That, in order to arrest the increase of Pauperism, and to relieve the distressed condition of the Working Classes, it is expedient that measures be adopted for facilitating the Emigration of poor families to British Colonies." He particularly urged the emigration of agricultural laborers as a remedy for the prevailing distress. Mr. Monsell, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary for the Colonies, in his reply to the motion favored the "hands-off" policy; emigration had done very well without state intervention. The question was put and the House divided, yeas to the right, noes to the left. "So it passed in the Negative," 48 to 153.[47] Government had acted on the subject two weeks earlier, when Earl Granville sent a circular dispatch, February 14, 1870, to the governors of the various colonies asking what number of emigrants could be absorbed. By the first week in August the Commissioners were able to summarize the answers received. "There is clearly no opening for emigrants from the United Kingdom in the Cape"; the demanad for European labor there was anything but steady. Queensland could take certain classes only. In the sister colony, New South Wales, opinions differed; employers wanted more labor, but the workers feared a reduction of wages, and between the two there was a determined struggle. The situation in South Australia was as in the Cape. Neither Western Australia, Tasmania, nor New Zealand could give any assistance towards emigration; Victoria could give

[46]Report 33, pp. 1-10, appendix 22. *Vide supra.*

[47]Many others spoke in the debate, among them Mr. Gladstone; March 1, 1870. *Hansard,* CXCIX. 1002-1077. *Common Journals,* CXXV. 62.

a little. Commissioner Murdoch had made personal inquiries while in Canada and reported that Lower Canada had little demand for laborers; except upon the Intercolonial Railway construction there was little opening in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; Upper Canada had her own agents to attend to immigration.[48]

A year later the subject again came up briefly when Mr. Wm. McCullagh Torrens proposed a motion favoring a scheme of assisted emigration. The Commissioners' opinion was sought whether the colonies would contribute anything to such a scheme. "Canada," Murdoch replied, "it may be taken for granted will contribute nothing," nor could she be expected to; the same was true for the other colonies. And there were serious objections to using imperial funds: (1) such a scheme would be certain to arrest contributions from private sources; (2) unless a large annual grant were voted, it would reduce instead of extend the amount of emigration; (3) to make such a grant to supersede what is now paid for out of private sources would be unjust to the British taxpayer; (4) it would impair the sense of independence of the laboring class generally; (5) it would be impossible to guard against imposition and jobbery; (6) if controlled by the colonies, there would be disaffection in the mother country; if controlled by the mother country, the colonies would be disaffected. Finally, "there is in this country plenty of employment for all who are able to work . . . For the feeble, the idle or the irregular there is no work here—but neither would there be in the Colonies."[49] These were the same arguments that had been used for thirty years, but they were arguments difficult to refute.

The days of the Emigration Board were numbered now and

[48]Murdoch uses the terms Upper and Lower Canada instead of the new names Ontario and Quebec. Murdoch to Rogers, 5 August 1870. C.O. 386/78, pp. 23-35. Printed in P.P. c.296 and c.335 (1871). See also *Hansard,* CCIV. 1394; CCV. 272-273.

[49]Murdoch to Holland, 12 April 1871. C.O. 386/119, pp. 138-143.

its duties and staff were gradually being reduced.[50] The need for a special Emigration Commission was passing; colonization was no longer a great and crying question as it had been thirty years before; emigration had become a regular, orderly trade, and more of a colonial than a "home" problem. So the Emigration Commission, its work done, suspended its activities one by one. One of the functions transferred to other hands was that of preparing the regular statistical returns of emigration; this, along with the administration of the Passengers Act, went to the Board of Trade, and the Commissioners issued no more annual reports. The last return submitted by the Emigration Board, 18 January 1873, was noted: "I shall part with these returns without regret. They are of little value as affording information as to the destination and settlement of emigrants . . . [E. H. Knatchbull-Hugessen]." The Colonial Secretary, Lord Kimberley, however, was of quite a different mind: "I cannot say I think these statistics uninteresting or valueless. I conclude the Board of Trade will continue to issue them and will furnish them to us. If they issue them, ask

[50]The emigration statistics for 1867-1872 may be summarized:

Year	Total	U.S.A.	B.N.A.	A.&N.Z.	Others
1867	195,953	159,275	15,503	14,466	6,709
1868	196,325	155,532	21,062	12,809	6,922
1869	258,027	203,001	33,891	14,901	6,234
1870	256,940	196,075	35,295	17,065	8,505
1871	252,435	198,843	32,671	12,227	8,694
1872	295,213	233,747	32,205	15,876	13,385

The English emigration in 1870 (105,293) was the largest yet on record, 16% over 1869; but that of 1872 went to 118,190. Irish and Scotch emigration remained steady, while foreign rose. In 1870 only 9779 travelled to America in sail vessels, in 1871 8403, and in 1872 just 4106 while 261,846 went by steam. The Commissioners quoted the following figures:

	Population, census 1861	census 1871	total emig'n.
England and Wales	20,066,224	22,704,108	605,165
Scotland	3,062,294	3,358,613	148,082
Ireland	5,798,967	5,402,759	818,582

Reports 28, pp. 1-3; 29, pp. 1-6; 30, pp. 1-11; 31, pp. 1-3; 32, pp. 1-5; 33, pp. 1-10.

them to send them regularly to us." A letter was sent as Kimberley directed, and the Board of Trade agreed to assume this task formerly performed by the Commissioners. Their first returns, 18 April 1873, were upon old Emigration Board forms.[51] With the year 1872 the work of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission in enforcing the passenger-ship legislation and in supervising the great exodus from the United Kingdom came to an end.

[51]C.O. 384/101. The following minutes may be of interest; on returns for the first quarter of 1872: "16/4/72. Emigrants persist in going to the *United States.*" On return for June of the same year: "The Emigration to the United States is as 6 to 1 compared with that to British North America." C.O. 384/100.

VIII

GOVERNMENT EMIGRATION

THE commission to Elliot, Torrens and Villiers empowered them to apply the monies arising from the sales of colonial lands towards defraying the expense of the removal of emigrants from the United Kingdom to those colonies.[1] In his instructions Russell considered in detail the performance of this duty, pointing out that the Commissioners' activities in this respect would be confined largely to the Australian colonies; for in the Canadas the sale of land was vested in the colonial authorities, and, too, there was no need for an emigration fund there as the spontaneous emigration was large enough. For the first two years little was done in this direction even in the Australian colonies because of the lack of funds. Then in 1842 the Australian Waste Lands Act (5 & 6 Vict., c.36) fixed a minimum price with sale by auction for all Australian lands and stipulated that one-half of the proceeds was to be devoted to the promotion of immigration. The Emigration Commissioners handled the expenditure of these sums from the various colonies and set on foot a great "government emigration." There were two classes of emigrants included under this head, the "free" and the "assisted." The former were persons of certain specified classes, approved by the authorities, who received free passages; the assisted were those proceeding under remittance, nomination, passage warrant, or other regulations, their expenses being borne partly by colonial funds and partly by the emigrant himself or, more often, by relatives and friends who had already emigrated.[2]

[1]Repeatedly the Board had to inform correspondents that: "There are no funds at the disposal of the Commissioners raised in this Country, and applicable directly to the relief of distress. The only funds they have are Colonial funds, procured by sales of land in the Colonies, and to be expended in sending out persons desirable for Colonial purposes." C.O. 386/24, pp. 143-144, and *passim*.

[2]*Vide infra* for explanation of the various systems.

The history of government emigration, from the point of view of control, falls into two periods divided by the year 1856. In the years between 1840 and that date the systems of emigration were arranged by the Commissioners in London. They too arranged for the transportation of the emigrants selected, chartering the necessary ships, fitting them out in proper manner, appointing a surgeon-superintendent to watch over the emigrants during the voyage, drawing up the dietary scale and the regulations for ventilation and discipline to be observed on board. The funds for all this, handled by the Commissioners, came from the colonial land revenues as provided under the act of 1842. In the period after 1856 there came a gradual change. In that year four of the Australian colonies (New South Wales, South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria) received approval for constitutions[3] which gave them responsible self-government and control of their own waste lands. Eight years later Queensland was added to the list. Western Australia, the other colony in that continent, continued until 1867 to receive convicts and in addition a supposedly equal number of free emigrants conveyed at the expense of the imperial government. With this one exception, however, the emigration funds in the second period came from the votes of the colonial governments, and not automatically from the land revenues. The colonies drew up their own plans and regulations, without consulting the Commissioners, and one after the other appointed their own emigration agents. At first most of these agents worked in co-operation with the Commissioners, selecting and approving the emigrants, and leaving to the Board, as of yore, the chartering of the necessary ships, and supervision of the voyages. Eventually, however, the Commissioners' work came to an end as the colonies took over in entirety the conduct of the emigration, or else ceased the expenditure of colonial funds upon its promotion. By 1869

[3]18&19 Vict., cc.55 and 56. The Australian Colonies Government Act of 1850 prepared the way for these constitutions.

government emigration so far as the Commissioners were concerned had almost entirely ceased.

In the conduct of government emigration the Commissioners took it as their guiding principle that they were

> responsible for securing to the best of [their] power the safety, health, comfort, and good conduct of the emigrants during the voyage, and their adaptation to the wants of the colony to which they are sent; . . . the means of attaining these objects [lay] in the careful choice and judicious fitting of vessels—the regular issue of good and sufficient provisions—the establishment of proper regulations for the conduct of the voyage—the appointment of a proper officer for the enforcement of these regulations, and for the medical care of passengers—and finally, the proper selection of emigrants with a view to the wants of the colony.[4]

The initial selection of emigrants for free passages was done by agents scattered throughout the United Kingdom who were paid a fee for each emigrant whose qualifications met with the final approval of the Board.[5] The selection of suitable emigrants was by no means an easy task, and it was on this head alone that the Commissioners met with adverse criticism. Practically all of this criticism, however, came during the time of the Australian gold rush when the Commissioners, in order to maintain the numerical equality of the sexes in the gold colonies, sent out large numbers of young Irish women.

For the capable arrangements made for the conveyance of emigrants the Board received great praise. "It is gratifying to hear the expressions of satisfaction and thankfulness which most emigrants give utterance to when they find out how much is done for their comfort, by the order and regularity established on board the fine ships chartered by the Commission-

[4]"It is also our duty to provide for these objects at the least possible cost." Report 10, p. 11.

[5]See C.O. 384/77. As far as possible free emigrants were selected from the three parts of the United Kingdom in proportion to their population. In the bounty system after 1843 the contractors were left free to choose their own emigrants; but under the nominee and passage warrant systems the emigrants were sometimes required to obtain the approval of the Emigration Board.

ers."[6] Wakefield too gave his word of commendation: "By following the example [set by the South Australian Commissioners], the New Zealand Company and the Colonial Office Commissioners in Park-street have brought about a revolution in the character, at least, of long-sea emigration for the poorer classes."[7] The Board engaged none but first-class vessels, which were fitted out according to their specifications. The ships were dispatched as a rule from Southampton, Plymouth and Birkenhead, ports at which the Commissioners, by the '60s, had established depots where the emigrants were lodged and fed free until time for embarkation. The Board drew up regulations governing the discipline on board the vessels and also fixed the dietary scale to be used.[8] Emigrants supplied their own clothing which was, however, inspected by an officer. Provisions, cooking utensils, bedding, etc., were supplied free and the various articles given to the emigrants at the end of the voyage if they had behaved well.

Medical attendance was also supplied free. Every ship chartered by the Commissioners carried on board a "surgeon-superintendent." In 1847 Lord Grey had sanctioned the engagement of surgeons on a permanent footing and on a scale of progressive remuneration;[9] as a result the Board was able to build up a corps of able, experienced officers. In the rush of

[6]Wilcocks, *Emigration,* p. 13.

[7]Wakefield, *Art of Colonization,* (Collier edition), p. 414.

[8]These regulations, the first being those of Elliot in 1838, were the result of long experience.—The Commissioners experimented in their ships with distilling and ventilating apparatus, new style of bedding, and other devices to improve the comfort and health of the emigrants. See C.O. 386/72, pp. 117-120; see also *supra.*

[9]September 1847: for the first two voyages 10/- a head was paid for all emigrants landed alive, for third and fourth voyages 12/-, for fifth and sixth 14/-, and for the seventh and subsequent voyages 16/-. C.O. 386/64, pp. 310-313. June 1858: this scale was extended to encourage men to remain in the service and to raise the class from which the surgeons were drawn; seventh and eighth voyages now drew 16/-, ninth and tenth 18/-, and eleventh and subsequent 20/-. C.O. 386/72, pp. 120-121. Naval surgeons were employed as a rule.

1849 there were 131 surgeons employed and in 1855 some fifty-eight; then as the work of the Board decreased the corps of officers was reduced, and when operations practically ended in 1869 there were twenty-one surgeons in service, of whom eighteen had served on ten to twenty voyages.[10] In addition to the surgeons matrons were employed on some ships. In 1849 the "British Ladies Female Emigration Society" offered its aid in the selection of suitable women. "Since that time matrons have been appointed to every ship carrying single females."[11] Whenever possible a clergyman or a schoolmaster was appointed to take charge of the religious needs and education of the people during the voyage.[12]

The general history of the emigration conducted by the Commissioners at the expense of colonial funds may be divided into four periods. During the first seven years, 1840 to the end of 1846, business was not very brisk: the Board sent out but 151 ships with 30,854 emigrants.[13] In addition there were fifty-two ships with 6626 sent out by the New Zealand Company under the Board's supervision. By 1845 a decline had set in; the Australian colonies were not attracting settlers and but 830 went out in that year; of these only ninety-five were "government." In 1847 there was renewed activity and in a period of four years (October 1847—December 1851) the Board sent out 249 ships with 63,174.[14] It was at this time

[10]Many of these men were then transferred to the Indian coolie emigration to the West Indies. Report 30, p. 13.

[11]Report 19, pp. 11-18. The appointments were made by the Commissioners, or by them on recommendation of the "Ladies," or by the surgeons. For New South Wales a permanent corps of matrons was established. See *Hansard,* CLIII. 34-35.

[12]The "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel" had communicated with the Commissioners on the matter early in 1849. Report 9, pp. 1-10. See also Lyttleton, *passim.* Emigrant clergymen or other suitably educated persons were offered free passages in the Commissioners' ships in return for these services.

[13]36 ships with 6453, and 115 with 24,401 bounty emigrants.

[14]To New South Wales and Port Phillip (Victoria) 37,754 in 146 ships; others 25,420 in 103 ships.

that two new systems were put into operation in New South Wales, South Australia and Cape Colony. Persons depositing sums in purchase of land in these colonies were permitted to nominate for free passage in the Commissioners' ships a certain number of emigrants. Secondly, colonists were allowed to transmit, through deposits in the "military chest" of the colony, money to be used in the emigration of relatives or friends. "It is to be hoped that these regulations may prove the commencement of a system of mutual aid analogous to that which . . . [is] . . . a prominent feature in the Irish emigration to North America, and may so far tend to the establishment of that great desideratum, a self-supporting stream of emigration to the Australian colonies."[15]

The greatest period of government emigration came with the Australian gold rush which gave a great impetus to the sale of lands and the promotion of emigration. Indeed the rush beginning in 1852 gave such a stimulus to government emigration to all the colonies that the funds available were insufficient to meet the demands. On one or two occasions the Commissioners were attacked in parliament for impeding emigration by the stringency of their regulations; and Earl Grey, in defending them against these charges, had to point out that they were simply acting as "trustees for the colonies."[16] In the six years 1852—1857, 176,418 settlers were carried out at the expense of the colonial governments in 532 ships chartered and directed by the Emigration Commissioners.[17] This was the most important period in the whole history of government emigration, for the great influx of men to the gold fields of Australia had brought forward a serious problem.

Scarcely any women accompanied them at all. It is difficult to see how the gold colonies could have prospered at all, although not difficult to see that they must have contained a mass of moral

[15]Report 10, p. 19.

[16]*Hansard,* CXXI. 672-680.

[17]Again New South Wales and Victoria drew the bulk, 131,466 (380 vessels); others 44,952 (152).

contamination, had it not been for the "Wakefield system" and its wise application by the Commissioners. They turned their attention, as far as they possibly could, to the essential (and by no means easy) task of organizing an extensive female emigration. . . . The result of their operations was highly successful. . . . If Victoria has been free from the worst features of the turbulence, vice, and insecurity, which attended the height of the gold fever in California—if law and order never ceased in the roughest time to prevail there substantially—if it has formed itself rapidly and completely into a thriving civilized community, from a mere collection of fortune-hunters—it owes this pre-eminence in part, we may flatter ourselves, to the advantages of British institutions, but probably much more to the accessions to the female population contributed through the "Wakefield system." Here, then, that system has produced a result highly beneficial, but altogether beside the views of its founders, and which could not by possibility have entered into their contemplation.[18]

The attempts of the Board to increase the number of single young women sent out in their ships were not fully appreciated by the colonies, however; in several strenuous objection was made to the type of women selected, and there was talk of appointing colonial agents to handle the government emigration.

As the gold rush came to an end and as land sales began to fall, the government emigration decreased. Towards the end of the boom period some of the Australian colonies had been granted responsible self-government, which meant, of course, control of their own lands and revenue. In view of the recent expressions of dissatisfaction it was to be expected that these colonies would immediately appoint their own agents to control the colonial-financed immigration, and the Commissioners in their Report for 1856 noted that: "In consequence of the probable transfer of the selection of emigrants for Australia from the Board to agents appointed by the several Australian Colonies, it has been thought right to reduce the number of the Commissioners . . . As yet no such transfer has been made, though in the case of Victoria, our operations . . .

[18]Merivale, *Lectures,* pp. 472-473.

will cease at the end of the current half-year" (30 June 1857).[19] The transfer, however, did not take place as quickly as anticipated. Three years later only South Australia had actually withdrawn, while New South Wales and Victoria were preparing to do so. "So far therefore as the selection and dispatch of emigrants is concerned, our operations, which since the middle of 1847, though varying in extent, have never been interrupted, may (with the exception of Queensland) be considered as for the moment suspended."[20] The appointment of these colonial agents was due, as Mr. Monsell later told the Commons, "to an unfounded fear that our Emigration Commissioners, who had done their work so admirably would select emigrants having regard rather to the persons we desired to get rid of than to the persons they desired to have."[21] The colonies too often forgot that the Commissioners were not confronted with the problem of selecting the best emigrants in the British Isles, but with the quite different problem of taking the best they could get.

The government emigration conducted by the Commissioners did not, however, entirely cease; in fact by 1862 it was beginning to increase again. The colonies were now turning away from free emigration and concentrating more and more upon remittance and nomination schemes. In the spring of 1865 the Board recorded that "the system of free passages has

[19]Report 17, p. 49. See also *infra.*

[20]Report 21, pp. 13-14. During these fourteen years (1847-60) the Board had sent out

to Australia	851	ships	with	266,099	emigrants;	mortality	1.88%
to the Cape	41	"	"	10,668	"	"	1.33
to Natal	7	"	"	651	"	"	.61
a total of	899	"	"	277,418	"	"	1.85

The total number of deaths was 5152. "It is with sincere gratitude and the highest satisfaction that we add that, with the exception of one vessel, the *Guiding Star,* which never reached her destination, we have never had an accident in any of our ships attended with loss of life." See *ibid.,* appendix 32.

[21]*Hansard,* CXCIX. 1021. (1 March 1870).

now been almost entirely discontinued in the Australian colonies, except in the case of female domestic servants," who were selected by the Commissioners in small numbers for Victoria and Queensland. For Western Australia they carried on a small emigration, the expense of which was defrayed by parliamentary votes.[22] In 1866 Queensland appointed her own agent; and then, with the transfer to Mr. Verdon, on 1 June 1869, of the Victoria emigration, the Board's "operations so far as regards the selection of emigrants and the chartering of ships for the Australian colonies came, at least for a time, to a close."[23] There remained only the "parliamentary emigration" to Western Australia, nominee emigration to Natal and the Falkland Islands, and, for a short time, the selection of young women for New South Wales, to be handled by the Commissioners. None of these four was at all extensive. During this period of diminishing operations, 1858—1869, the Board had chartered 307 vessels and sent out 99,746 new citizens for the Empire overseas.[24]

The great period of government emigration had been that from 1847 to 1869, during which the Emigration Board chartered 1088 ships for the conveyance of 339,338 souls, at an expense of about £4,864,000, all but £523,000 of which came

[22]Report 25, p. 15.

[23]Report 30, p. 11.

[24]

Colony	Ships	Emigrants	Colony	Ships	Emigrants
N.S.W.	85	31,323	New Z.	2	643
Vict.	67	24,869	Cape	32	9,052
Queen'd.	29	9,112	Natal	19	2,196
S. Aus.	56	19,778	Falk. Is.	—	147
W. Aus.	17	2,514			
Tasmania	—	112	Total	53	12,038
Total Australia	254	87,708			

Grand total 307 ships, 99,746 emigrants. W. Australia, the Cape, Natal and the Falkland Islands were not self-governing. When the Board was abolished in 1878 only Natal and the Falklands were using its services (*vide infra*).

from colonial funds.[25] The number of deaths during this period totalled 5,504 or 1.69 per cent. This may seem rather high, but two points should be borne in mind: (1) in this period there were several cholera years, and (2) in the government emigration there was always a larger number of children than in the general emigration; most of the deaths occurred among the children.[26] The emigration had been to a large degree free from accident; five ships had been lost, but only one, the *Guiding Star,* with loss of life.[27] The results then were, on the whole, satisfactory.

South Australia

South Australia had been the first colony to establish a system of immigration financed by the colonial land revenue, but when Elliot, Torrens and Villiers received their two commissions in January 1840, the financial affairs of the colony were in a bad state. The new Commissioners refused to accept bills drawn by the governor, the colony went bankrupt, parliamentary investigations began, and for four years there was no government, and practically no general, emigration.[28] The outcome was the establishment of South Australia as an ordinary colony under the Crown (5 & 6 Vict., c.61). It then set

[25]Private funds and a small amount from the imperial treasury made up the balance. Passage rates varied from £9.10 to £23.

[26]See, for instance, the emigration to India, in 1859-60, of the wives and children of soldiers serving there. Despite every precaution which the Commissioners' experience suggested, measles and scarlet fever broke out, and over 32% of the children under four years of age died; the total mortality on the voyage was 9.98%. Report 20, pp. 13-20.

[27]The *Guiding Star* carried down 543 with it (January 1855). See summary in Report 30, pp. 11-13.

[28]See Mills, *Colonization of Australia.* This was a busy time for the Commissioners. "Your Lordship [Russell] is aware that, by the nature of its constitution, almost every affair of the ordinary administration of Government in this colony falls within our cognizance, and that circumstances have recently rendered it a subject requiring more than usual anxiety and care." Report 1840, p. 5. Capt. George Grey, sent out to succeed Gawler as resident commissioner, carried a commission and instructions signed by Torrens and Villiers. C.O. 386/18, pp. 68-78.

to work to recover its prosperity, while the Commissioners found ample employment in the investigation of claims.[29]

As expenditures went down and revenues rose, it became possible to renew the government emigration. In 1844 a ship was dispatched with 123 on board and a second ship in 1845. Then colonial funds increased still further, there was a great demand for labor, and from 1846 on the volume of assisted emigration rapidly expanded. The Board made plans to send at least one ship a month, their aim being, "without producing any over-supply of labour at any one particular moment, to render the accruing resources from land available, to prevent a stoppage of the active pursuits of the colony from want of hands."[30] In 1849 a system of nomination emigration was put in operation: every land purchaser was entitled to nominate for free passages three adults for every £80 paid, nominees being subject to approval by the Commissioners. A plan of remittances through the colonial treasury was also inaugurated, enabling colonists to send home money for the emigration of relatives and friends in the ships of the Emigration Commission.[31]

Just at this time the Commissioners got into trouble through their attempts to maintain numerical parity between the sexes in the colony. In 1848 some Irish female orphans had been sent to South Australia; reports were, on the whole, not favorable and the emigration was immediately stopped.[32] At the time of the gold rush some more young Irish women were sent out, and once again complaints were received. Some of

[29]"The great extent of Government liabilities incurred in South Australia, followed by the distress which ensued, had given rise to numerous and complicated claims, both of private parties and of the public servants, which it has been necessary for the Governor to examine and deal with. The revision of these claims has . . . demanded a large share of time and attention at this office, where alone the records of South Australia had been preserved in any complete state." Report 1843, pp. 17-19.

[30]Report 7, pp. 18-26. A truly Wakefieldian principle.

[31]Report 9, pp. 21-25.

[32]*Ibid.* and Report 10, p. 36.

the reports conflicted, however, and the Commissioners were in a quandary what to do.[33] The colonial legislature, very indignant, threatened to appoint their own agent to supervise the government emigration; such a move was welcomed by the Board.

> The Colonial Government so far from making allowance for these circumstances [the difficulties in procuring young women of a suitable type] endeavours to impute to us the whole responsibility for inconveniences arising principally from their own omission to furnish us with information and instructions. It is possible that they might repose more confidence in Officers appointed by and responsible to themselves than in Officers holding their appointments from the Crown and responsible only to the Secretary of State. At all events they are not likely to do us justice until they have had experience through their own Agents of the difficulty of conducting Emigration on a large scale in a safe and satisfactory manner. We trust therefore that we may be allowed to hope that if the Colonial Legislature should desire as Sir R. McDonnell anticipates to transfer the selection of their Emigrants to other hands than ours the Governor will not offer any opposition to such an arrangement.[34]

The outcome was that the colony, which had become self-governing in 1856, appointed its own agent to select emigrants (1858), and the Board was, very thankfully, relieved of that responsibility although it was still to have charge of the shipping arrangements. At the same time the colony passed an act to establish its own emigration systems.[35]

[33]"It was alleged that that emigration, under the circumstances of the moment, had thrown on the colonial funds a heavy expense for an unsuitable population, and some apprehension was even expressed as to the probability of their ever finding honest employment. It is gratifying to know that any apprehension on that score was unnecessary." Report 18, pp. 32ff. See also C.O. 384/96 and 98. Hodder makes some unjust reflections on the conduct of the Commissioners (*Angas,* pp. 354-355).

[34]Commrs. to Merivale, 10 February 1857. C.O. 386/79, pp. 96-97. McDonnell was governor of South Australia.

[35]Report 18, pp. 11-24. The agent was appointed subject to the consent of the Commissioners to act in co-operation; this they were only too glad to do, as such an arrangement would be more satisfactory to South Australia. The Commissioners, however, did not attempt to force their services on the colony. In 1859 when the agent proposed some alterations in the

Government Emigration

By 1859 the labor market of the colony was flooded; government emigration had been declining since 1855 and now, on the orders of the governor, was suspended, and the balance of the colonial funds in the hands of the Commissioners was paid over to the colonial agent.[36] Two years later emigration was renewed, but on a limited scale and under new regulations: plans were prepared for free, assisted, passage warrant (or deposit certificate), and bounty emigrations. The colonial agent selected the free emigrants and approved the others, while the Board continued to charter and fit out the ships required.[37] Government emigration then rose from 1066 in 1862 to 4848 in 1865. In 1866 there was a slight decrease, followed next year by a sharp contraction to one vessel, and entire cessation in 1868. No more ships were chartered by the Commissioners;[38] their connection with the colony ended, and all assisted emigration under the agent seems to have been terminated. Between 1858 and 1869 the Board had chartered 56 ships for the colony and sent out in them 19,778 settlers; some 60,000 had been assisted in the years prior to 1858.

New South Wales

Encouraged by the initial success of the South Australian experiment the imperial government in 1837 had started an assisted emigration to New South Wales under the management of the Agent-General and financed by the colonial funds.

shipping arrangements they declined. "We have accordingly informed Mr. Dashwood that so long as the Colonial Government desires us to continue responsible for the conduct of the Emigration we must decline to sanction the proposed arrangement. At the same time we have pointed out that if they should desire to transfer to Mr. Dashwood the responsibility of fitting and dispatching their ships there would be no difficulty in their doing so and that in that case we should be happy to give him every assistance in our power." Commrs. to Merivale, 10 December 1859. C.O. 386/79, p. 149.

[36]Report 20, pp. 33ff.

[37]Report 22, pp. 26-28. For details of the four systems see P.P. ♯430 (1863), pp. 5-6.

[38]In 1869 seventy-three government emigrants were sent out in a private vessel.

The second letter to the Colonial Office from the newly appointed Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners related to the revenue from that colony available for emigration purposes;[39] and during 1840 and 1841 several sets of regulations were published by the Commissioners providing for emigration on bounty, and for free passages to certain approved emigrants and to other approved persons nominated by land purchasers.[40] Lack of funds, however, prevented the establishment of any extensive government emigration, although some shipping firms introduced several thousand settlers on bounty during the years 1842 to 1844. The depression in the colony continued until 1847; then with a rising demand for labor a great government emigration was finally set on foot.[41] For the next two years the Commissioners sent out ships at the rate of four a month, divided between Sydney and Port Phillip (Victoria). After 1849 the emigration declined, only to be again accelerated by the great gold rush between 1852 and 1857.

Meanwhile some serious dissatisfaction had arisen in New South Wales as in South Australia, and the Legislative Council of the colony protested (1 May 1851) against the type of emigrants being sent out.[42] Colonial Secretary Grey in a long dispatch sent in reply maintained that the mother country should control the colonial waste lands and the disposal of them; then—

> [Since] Parliament has thought fit to entrust to the Crown the expenditure of the territorial revenue in the Australian colonies, with the obligation of applying not less than one-half of the net receipts from the sale of land to emigration from the United Kingdom, it is to me a subject equally of surprise and regret

[39]Commrs. to Stephen, 25 January 1840. C.O. 384/58. The first letter concerned the Commission's quarters.

[40]C.O. 384/59, 63 and 70. C.O. 386/24 and 26. Reports 1840, pp. 3-4; 1842, p. 17.

[41]See Reports for 1844, 1845, 1846 and 1847.

[42]The Council was protesting against the New South Wales Government Act (13&14 Vict., c.59), objecting particularly to the fact that the colony was not given control of its own waste lands.

that the Council should have seen reason to express the opinion, that the duty thus imposed on the advisers of the Crown has been so ill performed as to warrant the assertion, that the use of the territorial revenue had been in great measure confined to the introduction of people unsuited to the wants of the Colony, and in many instances the outpourings of the poor-houses and unions of the United Kingdom.

These views, he continued, were inconsistent with the information received from other sources. Between 1847 and 1851 the Emigration Board had sent out 31,400 to the colony, and of but a very small proportion was there any serious complaint.

Nor have there been wanting general testimonials of a gratifying nature to the satisfaction felt with the character of the emigrants selected and sent out by the Emigration Commissioners. . . . I am fully justified in asserting, that all the reports as to the emigrants made at the time of their arrival tend to establish the conclusion, that the arduous undertaking of collecting and conveying to Australia so large a body of people from all parts of the United Kingdom has been conducted in a manner highly advantageous to the Colony, and creditable to the Board by which it was conducted.[43]

A few years later, however, the colony got what it so strongly desired—self-government with the right to control its own lands.

After 1857 the government emigration fell in numbers and was suspended for a time in 1861.[44] New regulations were now drawn up by the colony, establishing a system of emigration under "passage certificates." Residents in the colony could nominate relatives or friends for free passages upon payment of a sum varying from £2 to £12 according to sex and age. Nominees must be either mechanics, domestic servants, or persons of the laboring class, in good health and of good character. Certificates were not transferable, but were valid for twelve months, "and for passages only in the ships of the Emigration Commissioners." The nominator was under obligation to provide for his nominees upon their landing.

[43]Grey, *Colonial Policy,* II. 325-327.

[44]Report 21, p. 13.

Two agents were sent to England in the summer of 1861 to work with the Commissioners in conducting this emigration.[45] For five years, 1862-1866, the Board chartered all the ships required and received high praise for its arrangements.[46] By 1867, however, the number of emigrants had greatly decreased and it was decided to discontinue the system of passage certificates "as not calculated to introduce the class most required in the colony."[47] The regulations were accordingly cancelled, December 1867, but not until the spring of 1869 were all the outstanding certificates used up. During the period this system was in force, June 1861 to December 1867, 16,623 nominees went out to New South Wales in the Commissioners' ships.[48]

In July 1870 the Board received a request from the colonial government to undertake the expenditure of a balance of £11,000 remaining from an old vote for immigration, in sending out female domestic servants. The Commissioners accepted, and, although unable to fully comply with the wishes of the colony concerning the numbers sent, succeeded in dispatching from time to time small parties of young women, accompanied by families to serve as protection. The local authorities were quite well satisfied with the persons received.[49] New South Wales, it might be noted, was exceeded only by Victoria in the total number of emigrants sent out by the Commissioners,—107,000 for the one and 118,000 for the other.

Victoria

After long years of agitation the thriving settlements around Port Phillip Bay were, in 1851, entirely separated from New South Wales and erected into the colony of Victoria. Almost immediately the discovery of gold within the colony brought an unheralded rush of settlers. This great influx of immi-

[45]Report 22, pp. 14ff. See also P.P. #430 (1863), pp. 4-5.
[46]Report 26, pp. 34-36.
[47]Report 28, p. 4.
[48]Report 30, pp. 31-33. The cost to the colony was about £10 a head.
[49]Reports 31, pp. 5-6; 33, pp. 11-13. C.O. 386/78, pp. 21-23.

grants, however, was almost wholly male, and the Emigration Commissioners, in order to avert the evils of that disproportion, did their utmost to increase the number of women in the government emigration. Their efforts were attended with considerable success;[50] during the period 1852-54 over 49,000 persons were assisted to Victoria by the Commissioners from the funds of the colony. By the end of 1855 the gold rush began to fall off, but the government emigration remained fairly large. It was just at this time that the colony received its constitution. The Commissioners were at once informed that they would be sent £100,000 for emigration up to June 30, 1857, but at that date they were to close their accounts and transfer the business to agents appointed by the colony. The Board replied that it would do everything in its power to facilitate the transfer and to prevent any interruption to the progress of the emigration; at the same time it expressed gratification at the "favourable terms in which the Secretary of State and the Colonial Government have been pleased to notice the past conduct of the Emigration."[51] Before the end of June arrived the Commissioners were asked to continue until August 1, until August 31, then until the end of the year; and finally word came that a bill to establish an emigration agency had been defeated in the colony and the Commissioners were requested to continue their work as of yore.[52] Four years later, in the spring of 1861, the Board wrote that the Victoria emigration would cease as soon as the small balance in their hands was exhausted.[53] But in July of that year new regulations were issued in the colony, and the Commissioners were again called on to continue their work.

Under the new regulations only single young women and

[50]*Vide supra* p. 209.

[51]Commrs. to Merivale, 18 December 1856. C.O. 386/80, pp. 123-124.

[52]Commrs. to Merivale, 11 June, 8 August, 12 October 1857, and 8 January 1858. *Ibid.*, pp. 127-133.

[53]Report 21, p. 13.

a few married persons were to be selected for free passages and conveyed by the Board. At the same time a great system of "passage warrant" emigration was to be conducted in private ships chartered by the colony. These warrants could be transferred with the consent of the Emigration Commissioners.[54] Two years later, in September 1863, the colony passed an act to appoint an agent-general and six "Emigration Commissioners" for Victoria to conduct emigration from the United Kingdom.[55] These agents were to handle all branches of the emigration. Once again there was a hitch in the proceedings and the imperial Commissioners were asked to temporarily continue their work of selecting and dispatching single females; they consented, but for a limited time only.[56] The amount of emigration conducted by the Board had dropped sharply after 1863; only two ships were chartered for 1864 and 1865 and four in 1866. Late in that year, however, the colony asked the Commissioners to resume the conduct of all Victoria emigration, that is, passage warrant as well as single female.[57] This arrangement lasted for two years, and then, for the fourth time, the colony asked the Commissioners to transfer the business to the Agent General for Victoria on December 1, 1868. The necessary arrangements were made; again there was a hitch—the agent wasn't ready—and the

[54]Report 22, pp. 24-26. Warrants cost £8, £7, and £3.10 for males over 40, between 12 and 40, and under 12 years; and £4, £3, and £2.10 for females of the same categories; the colony paid £14 passage for each adult and £7 for each child. Some passage warrant holders went out in the Commissioners' ships.

[55]Murdoch objected to the title as likely to cause confusion and suggested instead the name "Victoria Agency for Emigration." Murdoch to Rogers, 27 November and 18 December 1863. C.O. 386/80, pp. 234-235.

[56]Report 24, pp. 24-30.

[57]Since 1861 the passage warrant holders had been going out in vessels provided by contract between the colony and a private firm. Any extra clerks needed by the Board under the new arrangement were to be paid out of colonial funds. Murdoch to Elliot, 22 November 1866. C.O. 386/80, p. 325.

Board was asked to continue until June 1, 1869.[58] This time the transfer was actually made. Victoria, the first of the Australian colonies to propose an agent, was the last to make the transfer.[59]

Queensland

The colony of Queensland, like its southern sister Victoria, was originally a part of New South Wales and did not begin an independent life until rather late. The nucleus of the colony was Moreton Bay, the site of its capital Brisbane, which began as a convict station in 1826. After 1840, with the cessation of transportation, Moreton Bay became more and more important as a sheep-raising district and developed rapidly. Finally on December 1, 1859, it was erected into a separate colony with responsible government. The legislature immediately voted £5000 for immigration purposes in 1860, and an extensive government-financed movement was commenced. Several plans were put in operation: free passages were granted to female domestic servants of good character and to agricultural laborers, shepherds and railroad laborers; assisted passages were given to persons nominated by colonists on payment of £4 for emigrants aged twelve to sixty, and £2 for those one to twelve; persons paying their own emigration expenses received land orders good for the purchase of any government lands, to the value of £30 for adults over fourteen and £15 for children four to fourteen. Two travelling emigration agents were appointed for Great Britain and Germany to give lectures and diffuse information.[60] At first these colonial agents alone selected and approved the emigrants, but in 1863 the imperial Commissioners were given concurrent powers in that respect. From the beginning all the assisted emigrants were sent out in ships chartered by the Board. This continued until 1864 when

[58]Report 29, p. 4.

[59]Except for Western Australia which was under special arrangement.

[60]Reports 21, pp. 27-28; 22, appendix 28; 24, pp. 20-24 and appendices 39 and 40. P.P. #430 (1863), p. 5.

the colony passed an act to appoint an agent to handle all its emigration, and in the following year the Commissioners handed over the work to the Agent-General.[61] In all, during the years 1860—1866, the Board had sent out twenty-nine ships with 9,112 emigrants for Queensland.

Tasmania

The colony of Van Diemen's Land, after 1853 renamed Tasmania, also began life as a convict settlement and not until 1853 was transportation there abolished. A year after their appointment the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners drew up regulations for a bounty emigration to the colony and sent out 912 settlers, followed by four shiploads the next year.[62] The colonial authorities gave "high testimony . . . to the character of the arrangements made in [England], as well as to the eligibility of the class of people selected, and the order in which they were taken out." But the large numbers of convicts under short sentences kept the labor market oversupplied, and moved Lieut. Governor Franklin to recommend the immediate discontinuance of emigration at the expense of the public revenue.[63] Not until 1852 was there again any extensive demand for labor.

Regulations drawn up in 1848 established a remittance emigration, enabling persons in the colony to assist relatives and friends to emigrate through the agency of the Board.[64] These were followed, 27 August 1849, by another set of regulations to encourage emigration and settlement in the colony of persons capable of employing labor.

[61]Report 25, pp. 32-34.

[62]See C.O. 384/63. C.O. 386/26, pp. 267½, 297½; 27, p. 25½; 58, pp. 58ff. Report 1842, pp. 17-18.

[63]Report 1843, pp. 11-13. Unassisted emigration too practically ceased. So serious was the lack of employment in the colony that many probationers and ticket-of-leave men were thrown on the government for support. Report 6, pp. 12-14.

[64]Report 9, pp. 16f. and appendix 15.

They afford considerable advantages to small capitalists,—and . . . allow to land purchasers considerable latitude in their selection of nominees. Land purchasers are permitted to apply their deposits wholly or in part towards defraying the cost, according to a particular scale, of their own emigration as cabin or intermediate, as well as steerage passengers. . . . As a further inducement to this emigration, the allowances have been liberally framed, which may have the effect of causing the expenditure to exceed the deposits, but it is intended to make up any such deficiency out of the parliamentary grant in aid of free emigration to this colony, as a place to which convicts are sent.

Through this plan it was hoped to make use of the labor surplus in the colony, but no great success seems to have been attained.[65] In 1850 some women emigrants were sent out to Van Diemen's Land, but the emigration was at once discontinued.[66]

When the transportation of convicts ceased in 1853 the colony began to feel a serious want of labor, and Newcastle asked the Commissioners to suggest an emigration scheme. After deferring their report for some time,[67] they finally proposed using the New South Wales system of bounty emigration under indenture, but suggested waiving the indenture in the case of single women.[68] The colony framed the necessary regulations and a bounty emigration began, but not conducted by the Board nor in any way under its control. "Our detailed information respecting it is derived from the reports of the colonial immigration agent, and is therefore necessarily in arrears."[69]

[65]Report 10, pp. 23-27 and appendix 13.

[66]Reports 11, pp. 11-12; 12, pp. 39-40.

[67]The neighboring colonies of South Australia and Victoria offered such strong counter-attractions (gold rush) that it was difficult to secure emigrants for Tasmania. A scheme proposed by the colony had, on the advice of the Commissioners, been disallowed.

[68]Commrs. to Merivale, 23 January and 28 February 1854. C.O. 386/77, pp. 1-12, 17-20.

[69]Report 18, p. 35. C.O. 386/77, pp. 37-47. The agent was in the colony, not in the United Kingdom. Tasmania's constitution went into operation two years later (1856).

Thereafter the Commissioners had little connection with Tasmania, and in the annual reports the colony figures but briefly and sometimes not at all. Immigration, assisted or unassisted, was very small after 1860; occasionally a few nominees were sent out in private vessels by the Board, but the total number between 1858 and 1869 was no more than 112.[70]

Western Australia

The Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners in January 1840 took over the duty previously performed by the Agent-General in regulating bounty emigration to Western Australia;[71] but for the first two years no government emigration took place. Regulations for two new systems were drawn up by the Commissioners in January 1841, to establish a nomination emigration[72] and a free emigration of mechanics, handicraftsmen, agricultural laborers and domestic servants.[73] All these plans, however, were held up for a time by the lack

[70]In 1861 the colony inaugurated an immigration on "bounty tickets"; see P.P. ♯430 (1863), p. 6. In 1867 another system (land orders) was established, and an emigration agent was appointed in the United Kingdom. Report 31, p. 20. A few members of convicts' families were sent out to Tasmania by the Board (see Report 32, p. 5); in 1878 this duty was taken over by the Crown Agents.

[71]This system, as regulated in October 1839, gave to the purchaser of land paying £100 or upwards (in even hundreds) the right to send one adult over 15 years, two children between 7 and 15, or three between 1 and 7, for each £20 paid. A bounty of £18, £10, or £5 was paid on each person according to class. All emigrants were subject to prior approval by the authorities. C.O. 384/58.

[72]Land was offered for sale at £1 per acre in tracts of 320 acres; the purchaser was entitled to nominate, for every £320 paid, emigrants equal to 14 statute adults, subject to the approval of the Board, who received free passages to the colony. Deposits for the purchase of land might be made in England. These rules applied also to New South Wales and New Zealand. C.O. 386/26, pp. 97-97½.

[73]Applicants were to be not less than 14 nor more than 35 years of age, and must produce certificates of vaccination and evidence of good character. Married couples, if young and preferably without children, would be accepted. These rules also applied to New South Wales and New Zealand. C.O. 386/26, p. 261½.

of funds and finally were postponed to the spring of 1842.[74] In that year two ships were dispatched with 354 settlers, and "the colonial authorities . . . spoke highly of the condition of the people on their landing."[75] When lack of funds again intervened, the Legislative Council asked for a loan from the home government but, "in conformity with the decision on other occasions not to grant such loans to any of the Australian settlements," the application was refused.[76] For the years 1843—1849 government emigration to the colony was negligible.[77]

After 1850 a new system came into operation. Transportation of convicts to New South Wales had ceased in 1840 and for the next nine years continued only to Van Diemen's Land. The numbers transported, however, were so large that the colony could not absorb them and there was a suspension of the movement in 1846. Two years later (July 1848) the imperial government offered to send an equal number of free emigrants to any colony accepting convicts. From every colony except Western Australia there was a decided refusal, so that after 1850 transportation was directed only to that colony and to Van Diemen's Land (until 1853). The free emigration in compensation, financed by annual parliamentary votes, was carried on by the Commissioners, but the number of free persons lagged considerably in arrears.[78] To offset the excess of

[74]C.O. 384/64 and 65. Early in 1842 Governor Hutt sent home a report from the Legislative Council desiring that the money arising from land sales be applied to the introduction of labor at an early date and that an agent be appointed. The Commissioners replied that the land funds were still insufficient, and objected strongly to this first move for an independent agent. C.O. 384/71.

[75]Report 1843, pp. 16-17.

[76]Report 1844, pp. 6ff.

[77]In the spring of 1847 the Commissioners remarked that "immigration may be said to have almost wholly ceased." Report 7, p. 19. Parkhurst prison boys to the number of 119 were sent out under the superintendence of the Commissioners in 1844, 1847 and 1848. Reports 5, p. 7; 8, p. 13; 9, p. 21.

[78]Memo., Murdoch to Rogers, 19 February 1869. C.O. 386/77, pp. 238-241. After some 2300 had been carried out in the years 1850-54 the labor

males over females resulting from transportation, the Commissioners began sending out groups of Irish women, but those dispatched in 1856 were not approved by the colonial authorities and the Board stopped sending that particular type.[79] As land sales in the colony increased, the volume of government emigration, though subject to considerable fluctuation, began to rise. About 1860 the colony established a nomination system and for the next twelve years the Board was engaged in sending out small numbers of nominees, as well as members of convicts' families and some free emigrants whose expenses were paid from the parliamentary votes.[80]

In 1864 Cardwell, the Colonial Secretary, asked the Commissioners for their opinion on the transportation of convicts to Western Australia; a vast new territory had been explored there and it was under consideration to exclude convict labor from this land. The Commissioners replied that in their opinion "nothing . . . but the entire discontinuance of transportation to Western Australia would . . . offer a fair prospect of the early success of the new settlement."[81] It was thereupon decided to discontinue transportation altogether at an early date, and in 1867 the practice came to an end. For some years longer, however, the Commissioners continued to send out free emigrants to make up the number promised. In 1869 the House of Commons was informed that the number of free emigrants due was about 1800, but as the colony was unable to absorb that many settlers none would be sent, except members of families of convicts, until the situa-

supply in the colony became too great and government emigration was suspended for two years. Report 15, pp. 38-40.

[79]C.O. 384/96. Reports 16, pp. 28-30; 17, pp. 35-37.

[80]In 1863 the Commissioners pointed out that those receiving free passages from imperial funds were "required to be for the most part unmarried females of good character, and a few married agricultural labourers, having if any, not more than two young children." P.P. #430 (1863), p. 7.

[81]Murdoch to Elliot, 2 November 1864. C.O. 386/77, pp. 185-189. Report 25, pp. 42-45.

tion improved. Two years later the situation was the same.[82] When the Emigration Board was abolished in 1878 the duty of providing passages for convicts' families was transferred to the Crown Agents. Western Australia made progress but slowly and did not receive the grant of responsible government until 1890.

New Zealand

New Zealand was declared a British colony a few months after the establishment of the Emigration Board in 1840. An attempt by the Commissioners to send out some settlers that year failed; but two years later they succeeded in dispatching some ships of their own, in addition to approving the certificates of the emigrants and inspecting the vessels sent out by the New Zealand Company.[83] From 1843 to 1847 all emigration was at a standstill; but land funds being again available in 1848 two groups of pensioners (163 families, 521 persons) were sent out. These "companies" were "composed of men who are considered to be capable of useful labour, and at the same time, to add to the security of the settlers."[84] The New Zealand Company also had actively resumed emigration, sending out seventeen ships with 2291 settlers between November 1847 and the spring of 1850.[85]

In 1852, the year following the dissolution of the New Zealand Company, the colony received a constitution, and the volume of work performed by the Commissioners was greatly decreased.[86] Three years later the several provinces had ap-

[82]On four occasions, 5 July 1869, 14 February and 4 March 1870, and 24 July 1871, Sir James C. Lawrence interrogated the government on the matter; the replies were the same. *Hansard,* CXCVII. 1166; CXCIX. 241-242, 1239; CCVIII. 155.

[83]Report 1843, pp. 24-25.

[84]Governor Grey settled some loyal natives near the pensioners' village to serve under their officers. Report 9, pp. 25-27. In 1851 259 more pensioners were sent out. Report 12, pp. 42-47.

[85]Most of the colonists went to Otago. Report 10, pp. 37-39.

[86]The Commissioners' correspondence to the Colonial Office concerning New Zealand occupied 62pp. for the last six months of 1852. For the next

pointed their own agents to conduct the government emigration, and the Commissioners henceforth had no connection with New Zealand emigration and could learn little about it.[87]

In 1863 the Commissioners received £5000 from the province of Canterbury to provide free passages for persons from the distressed districts of Lancashire; two shiploads (643 persons) were sent out.[88] This was the only New Zealand emigration conducted by the Board after 1857. Four years later (1867) Canterbury again wished to turn to the Commissioners; the local authorities were not altogether satisfied with the manner in which their emigrants had been sent out by the agent and expressed their desire to transfer the business to the Board "in the expectation that it might be more efficiently and even more economically carried on." The latter was reluctant to accept, considering it "could not undertake their Emigration at its present rate with any hope of being able to conduct it more economically than their present Agent"; if the provincial government insisted the Board would do its best but warned that a more perfect system might prove to be more costly.[89] The colony dropped the proposal, and the colonial agents continued to handle the New Zealand emigration, until in 1872 one agent, Dr. Featherston, was appointed by the general govern-

ten years the number of pages was: 1853 90; 1854 30; 1855 20; 1856 14; 1857 70; 1858 44; 1859 50; 1860 50; 1861 6; 1862 22. From 1858 on this correspondence was principally reports upon colonial legislation. C.O. 386/74. The amount of space given to the colony in the Commissioners' Reports decreased from three pages in Report 13 to one page as a general rule in the subsequent Reports. The comments related primarily to land laws and ordinances.

[87]See Reports 16-19 and 23. In 1857 the Commissioners reported 3807 emigrants to the colony, "but we are unable to state under what conditions these persons went out, or in what manner the expense of their passages was defrayed, the colonial government having furnished us with no information on the subject." Report 18, p. 41.

[88]Report 24, pp. 34-36. P.P. #430 (1863), p. 6. See also Report 23, pp. 29-33.

[89]Murdoch to Rogers, 30 April 1867. C.O. 386/75, pp. 89-92.

ment of the colony to replace the various provincial officers.[90] In all, some 1600, about one-half of them military pensioners, had been sent out by the Emigration Commissioners in the period between 1847 and 1872.

Cape of Good Hope

Although Cape Colony had served as the testing-ground for an early government experiment in colonization, it was not until after 1844 that emigration there became worthy of attention. In that year the colonial council voted £10,000 to defray the expenses of an European immigration, adopted the regulations proposed by the Emigration Commissioners, and placed the bounty emigration under their supervision and control.[91] The Commissioners personally inspected the first vessels which were sent out in November 1845 and February 1846; "as this is the commencement of a system of emigration to the Cape, which we hope will be continued, we were very anxious that the arrangements should meet with the approval of the local authorities."[92] After several months' successful operation, there was a brief suspension in 1847 due to frontier troubles (Kaffir War).[93] With the return of peace the bounty emigration was resumed, the colony voting the necessary funds from time to time. The Commissioners also established a nomination system similar to the Australian ones: persons in Great Britain desirous of purchasing land in the colony could deposit money to the Commissioners' credit at the Bank of England, and received the privilege of nominating for free passages a number of laborers, in the proportion of seven adults for each £100 deposited.[94] This system was supplemented by another,

[90]Report 32, pp. 1-5.

[91]C.O. 386/155, pp. 168-169. Report 5, p. 33. Tenders were called for the shipping, and that of John Marshall was accepted. The Board appointed surgeons for the ships, to be paid seven shillings for each emigrant landed alive, plus a salary from the shipowner.

[92]Report 6, pp. 53ff.

[93]Report 7, p. 53.

[94]Report 9, pp. 38-42.

established about the same time, "by which parties in the colony may, by depositing money in the hands of Government, enable their friends to join them." This emigration too was carried on by the Board.[95]

Emigration to the Cape was flourishing in 1850 when it was cut short by the lack of funds; the suspension lasted until 1857. At the close of the Crimean War members of the German Legion had gone out to the colony and located on the frontier. The soldiers had taken with them a smaller proportion of women than was desirable, so that, when funds from land sales again became available for emigration, Labouchere directed the Commissioners "to select from Ireland a party of respectable single women adapted for service in the Colony, accompanying them only with so many families as were necessary to maintain order on the voyage." These immigrants were received with much satisfaction by the colonists.[96] With further sums voted by the colony emigration now went on apace (2034 in 1858; 4051 in 1859). In 1859 an agent with two assistants was appointed to select the emigrants, while the Commissioners continued to arrange for their conveyance, appoint the surgeons, etc. But the movement soon began to subside, and after 1862 free passages to the colony were no longer granted. For a short time the agent provided assisted passages in private vessels to emigrants who fulfilled certain conditions;[97] but this arrangement ended almost immediately

[95]Report 10, p. 48 and appendix 44.

[96]Reports 12, p. 61; 17, p. 42. Governor Sir George Grey wrote, 28 December 1857, that the Commissioners "have evidently taken a great interest in procuring a good class of emigrants for us, and have performed a difficult duty very successfully." Report 18, pp. 220-221. Just at this time the colony, anxious to secure settlers, made arrangements with a German firm, Godeffroy of Hamburg, to supply 4000 emigrants in two years for Kaffraria. "On account of the expense as well as on other grounds, the scheme has been disapproved of by your Lordship [Stanley], and consequently . . . Messrs. Godeffroy's operations will at no distant date be brought to a close." *Ibid.*, pp. 46-48.

[97]P.P. #430 (1863), p. 7.

(1863), the agent was removed, and the colonial government requested the Commissioners "to superintend and manage the entire business, as the emigration is too limited for the employment of a separate agency."[98] For the next few years the Board arranged passages for the small numbers of government emigrants, usually sending them out in mail steamers. After 1866 all assisted emigration to the Cape of Good Hope ceased. Since 1847 the Commissioners had aided in sending out 12,251 settlers.

Natal

After a long period of hesitation Natal was declared a British colony in May 1843. The first ten years were full of conflicting claims to land titles,[99] and an attempt to establish a nominee emigration, under the superintendence of the Commissioners, did not meet with much success.[100] In 1858 a new system went into operation; the colonial government undertook to advance the passage money of nominees on condition that the nominator, a resident of the colony, promise to repay the expense at the rate of £10 per statute adult in annual payments of £10. The Commissioners were asked to make the best and most economical arrangement in their power for the conveyance of the nominees.[101] This system remained in operation until the end of 1869. A second scheme of emigration on land orders was established in 1867 and a colonial agent, Dr. Mann, was sent to England. Between June of that year and December 1869 he issued 259 land orders, but the Commissioners were not informed of the number of emigrants sent out. A depression in the colony then led to a suspension of the emigration vote and Dr. Mann ceased his operations;

[98]Report 24, p. 49.

[99]See Reports 5 to 12.

[100]Reports 8, p. 45; 10, pp. 48-52; 14, p. 63.

[101]Report 18, pp. 48-50. The cost of passage ran from £14 to £15.15; to defray the difference between that sum and the £10 guaranteed by the nominator the colony made an annual appropriation of £5000. Between 1858 and 1863 (inclusive) some 1600 were sent to the colony. Report 24, p. 50.

nominee emigration too apparently closed.[102] A few years later, in 1872, another system was adopted, and J. G. Rolls was sent to England to co-operate with the Commissioners. The agent received the applications for assisted passages and sent them to the Board for approval. The latter issued the embarkation orders and handled the payment of the passage money. The Union Steam Ship Company had a contract with the Commissioners to supply the necessary shipping. At the close of 1876 the financial part of the work was transferred to the Crown Agents, although the Board continued to approve the emigrants until March of 1878 when, with the final abolition of the Emigration Commission, the entire management of the Natal emigration was entrusted to the Crown Agents.[103]

Falkland Islands

When the far-off Falkland Islands in the South Atlantic were erected into a Crown colony, it was announced that lands were to be sold at a fixed price and at least one-half of the proceeds applied to emigration.[104] Little immigration, however, took place. Indeed, when Governor Rennie in 1849 urged the Commissioners to send out some young women so as to remedy the extreme disproportion between the sexes, lack of funds prevented any of the plans being carried through.[105] A few years later the Falkland Islands Company was formed and an arrangement was made whereby, in virtue of sums deposited with the Emigration Board for the purchase of land in the colony, the Company was permitted to nominate a cer-

[102]Reports 27, pp. 49-51; 29, pp. 43-44; 30, pp. 50-51.

[103]See correspondence, applications, etc., in C.O. 386/8. After Walcott's retirement the Colonial Office wrote to the governor asking if the colony wished the C.O. to continue supervision of its agent. When the governor replied that he did not believe it was advisable to remove this salutary supervision, the C.O. agreed to continue but expressed the hope that arrangements might soon be made to dispense with the necessity. C.O. 384/117.

[104]See correspondence in C.O. 386/45. The Commissioners published a pamphlet in 1842 dealing with the colony.

[105]Report 10, pp. 54-55.

tain number of emigrants. The Commissioners approved the nominations and superintended the arrangements. When the Board was abolished in 1878 the Crown Agents took over the management of this emigration along with the Natal one.[106]

Artizans and Pensioners

In the spring of 1869 the Admiralty arranged with the Emigration Commissioners to convey to Canada 1704 discharged "dockyard artizans." Government supplied free passages in army transports going out empty, while private parties paid the other expenses of the emigrants. In 1870 another group of 1368 went out under similar arrangements. At the end of that year a system for the emigration of commuted pensioners was arranged between the Commissioners and the Admiralty, War, and Post Office departments. In 1870 there were 23, in 1871 181, and in 1872 91 pensioners who availed themselves of this arrangement. Four years later when the Emigration Board was winding up its affairs (1876) it proposed to transfer the management of this emigration to other hands, but the three government bureaux felt that the number of commuted pensioners going out to the colonies was too small to warrant a continuation of the scheme and it accordingly came to an end.[107]

Vancouver Island

Reference has been made elsewhere to the negotiations for the resumption of Vancouver Island by the Crown. Long before the complicated questions had been settled, the Foreign Office was suggesting plans for the encouragement of British emigration and colonization. In accordance with the usual procedure it fell to the Commissioners to report on measures.

[106]The sums deposited covered the expense of the emigration. The Crown Agents took over the financial duties at the beginning of 1877 and the remaining work in April 1878. See C.O. 386/5; C.O. 384/112 and 121.

[107]Reports 30, pp. 3, 49-50; 31, pp. 4, 25-27; 32, pp. 1-5; 33, p. 10. C.O. 384/112 and 116. C.O. 386/6. C.O. 386/86, pp. 102-103, 158-159.

There were two serious obtacles, they said, in the way of any colonization scheme—lack of colonial funds for the purpose and the long and expensive voyage. "It seems to us hopeless to expect that any efforts which this Country can make at the distance of more than half the Globe to fill up the Territory with British born subjects could counterbalance the advantages which Americans possess from their immediate vicinity to it." The Commissioners could suggest no scheme, nor did they believe an experiment would be worth the cost. But if they could propose no plan, the Foreign Office would: why not encourage settlement by free grants of 25 acres to British subjects? The proposal was inane and received short consideration. Such a small grant of land would offer no temptation whatever to embark on a long and costly voyage; neither laborers nor capitalists would go, but Americans from the nearby states in all probability would. The proposal then would not accomplish what the Foreign Secretary had in view.[108]

[108]See Commrs. to Merivale, 24 November 1859 and 6 January 1860. C.O. 386/84, pp. 217-222; 85, pp. 1-3.

IX

(a) INDIAN (COOLIE) EMIGRATION TO MAURITIUS

MAURITIUS was the first of the British colonies to import free labor on a large scale from another part of the Empire. This migration of coolies from India first began in 1834, immediately after the abolition of slavery, and continued until 1839. During that period 25,468 coolies were introduced into the colony. One serious defect, however, was a great disparity between the sexes; out of the total number 24,566 were males. The labor importation was a purely private enterprise and resulted in so many abuses that the Indian government in 1839 prohibited any further recruitment of coolies.[1]

After an interval of three years renewal of the trade under the supervision of government officers was permitted by an order-in-council of 15 January 1843. A bounty on immigrants was to be paid in Mauritius; but despite the offer of a special bounty for women, the problem of a proper proportion between the sexes was to prove most perplexing throughout the whole period of coolie immigration. The imperial Emigration Board carefully examined the whole emigration, passed judgment on the colonial regulations, offered suggestions, and rendered assistance in every possible way. The new government-supervised scheme had an auspicious beginning; during the first three months (23 January-31 March 1843) 2156 immigrants were secured, and the mortality on the voyage was less than for Europeans. In all, between January 1843 and March 1844 two hundred ships were dispatched from India to Mauritius bearing 41,156 laborers, of whom 838 were Chinese. Then, after fifteen months' operation, the original bounty plan was terminated and replaced by a new system.[2]

[1]Report 6, pp. 32ff.

[2]Reports 1843, pp. 36-38; 1844, pp. 17f. The emigration was at first limited to Calcutta as the sole port of embarkation.

The new plan, inaugurated in March 1844, was to have the coolies selected, collected and dispatched from India by government officers alone.[3] The hopes of the authorities that expenses would thus be decreased and that a better selection of immigrants with a larger proportion of women would be secured, were to a large degree realized. Nevertheless the supply of labor was still insufficient[4] as the colonial funds were not ample enough to supply the six thousand men required by the planters each year. A colonial committee proposed certain measures as solution to the problem, and the Emigration Commissioners also took the matter under careful consideration and offered recommendations. They advised that the planters be encouraged to hire coolies for indefinite, and not stated, periods. The problem of funds they proposed to solve by a duty on exports and by an assessment on every person hiring labor imported at the expense of the government.[5] Secretary Gladstone approved these recommendations but during his brief tenure of office no specific instructions were issued. When Grey took over the seals of the Colonial Office in 1846 the difficulties of the colony were therefore still unsolved and becoming ever more perplexing.

The basic problem was that of securing labor and funds. In addition a better proportion of women and children must be secured among the immigrant coolies. Finally some attempt must be made to check the tendency among the Indians to return home before a proper period of service, and to frame regulations to ensure the immigrants working in return for the expense which had been incurred in their importation.[6] A

[3]"The whole measures for the selection and conveyance of the emigrants are devolved exclusively on a responsible Government Officer." Under the previous system the agent in India had merely supervised the trade. In the first six months after March 1844 the number of coolies imported was 2493. Report 5, pp. 22ff.

[4]In ten years of labor importation, 1834-44, 71,482 hill coolies (63,816 males) were introduced into Mauritius.

[5]Report 6, pp. 32-41.

[6]Deserters and absentees were many.

strong stimulus to exertion was needed and hitherto none had been provided. The planters asked for legalized contracts for labor for not less than three years, but prior to 1846 such engagements had been disapproved by the Secretary of State. Grey too frowned upon this proposal; he questioned the utility of legal measures to enforce labor.

> All experience tends to prove that no legal regulations, however severe, if they stop short of the extreme compulsion which is characteristic of slavery, can succeed in enforcing really efficient labour . . . from men who have no interest in being industrious. . . . Instead of encouraging the Indian labourers to enter, before they arrive at the Mauritius, into contracts to labour for several years for particular employers, and then endeavouring by stringent regulations to enforce the performance of these contracts, under circumstances in which it is the interest of the immigrants to break them; the true policy would be to adopt regulations, of which the effect should be, to make it the decided and obvious interest of the immigrants to work steadily and industriously for the same employers for a considerable time.

The Colonial Secretary therefore suggested certain measures to achieve these ends. Immigrants introduced at the public expense should be registered and required to enter into written engagements to work for a year for some planter, or to pay in advance a monthly tax of five shillings. The written engagement was to be subject to a stamp tax of forty shillings for the original, and twenty shillings for a renewal at the end of the year with the same master. Registered immigrants might not leave the colony until they had completed five years' industrial residence;[7] at the end of those five years, however, they were entitled to free passages back to India. If they returned earlier they had to pay their own expenses and in addition, before receiving their passport, £1 for every year wanting from the stipulated term. An ordinance founded on these principles was issued in Mauritius in 1847 and worked exceedingly well.[8]

[7]That is, residence during which the coolie had been under written engagement to work or had been paying the monthly tax.

[8]Grey, I. 68-75; see also Currey, p. 129. Similar laws were later passed in most of the West Indian sugar colonies.

The new regulations came at a very opportune time for the colony; in 1847 the apparent prosperity of the islands collapsed revealing many difficulties and evils. The planters insisted these were all due to the scarcity and dearness of labor, and clamored the louder for more coolies. They further complained that the immigrants from India did not give an adequate return in labor; too many were deserters and absentees. The Governor agreed but added that some of the blame must be laid on the planters themselves for their improvident speculation which had led to many commercial disasters. The immigration fund, saddled with a debt of £255,200, was in poor condition to meet the call for increased immigration. Yet another difficulty arose: in 1848 the coolies brought over when bounty emigration first began became entitled to return passages at government expense and began to leave for home.[9] With the new regulations in force, however, conditions soon began to improve. "These measures [Grey wrote in 1852] have been attended with complete success." Previously many of the immigrants had returned to India before their five years were up; others became vagrants, and 18 per cent. of those under engagement were absentees. After 1850 the complaints of these evils were greatly diminished; " . . . it appears that in every respect the existing system is working in a highly satisfactory manner." Further evidence as to the satisfactory operation of the new system was to be found in the reduced cost. In 1847 the Emigration Commissioners reported the cost of introducing one coolie as £6.13. 4; in 1850 and 1851 it averaged only £3. 3. 1 (excluding expenses incurred in India), so that "the immigration of labourers from India must be nearly, if not quite, self-supporting."[10] Originally the trade had been confined to the port of Calcutta, but as the supply

[9]Grey, I. 98ff. Report 8, pp. 26-29. Mauritius at that time had some 67,000 Indian inhabitants.

[10]Grey, I. 98-104. Reports 8, pp. 26-29; 9, pp. 31-33; 10, pp. 43-44. Another satisfactory feature noticed was that many coolies returned for a second period in the colony.

there was far in arrears, due in part to the lack of shipping, Grey agreed to the planters' request that Madras be opened, and an emigration agency was established there as well.

From the renewal of coolie immigration in the early part of 1843 until the end of 1849 the number of coolies imported from India to the Mauritius totalled 80,327. In the '50s the stream flowed in greater volume with most satisfactory results, except for the old problem of a proper proportion of females. In 1849 the year's total was 7,282; in 1850—9,823, 1851—9,771, 1852—16,796, 1853—12,144, 1854—18,516 and 1855—12,915. In 1856, however, an outbreak of cholera with excessively high mortality caused the Indian government to order the emigration of coolies stopped (October 1856), and only after some arrangements concerning quarantine enforcement had been made to the satisfaction of the government, was the renewal of emigration authorized (22 April 1857). During the stoppage wages in Mauritius had risen high, and in the ten weeks between 22 April and 30 June ten ships were sent from Calcutta to meet the great demand for labor.[11]

Just a year after immigration was renewed Secretary Stanley authorized a change in the system (4 June 1858). Hereafter each sugar-growing colony was to be allowed an agent of its own in India, and the establishment of a Mauritius agency at Bombay as well as Calcutta and Madras was authorized. The Indian recruiting agents, used to secure the supply of hill coolies, were hereafter to be licensed; on misconduct the license could be revoked by the government emigration agent.[12] The number of Indians now being carried to Mauritius had increased threefold over the number in 1850; in 1858 they totalled 29,946 and in 1859 44,397. The mortality was quite low, 1.69 per cent. and 1.73 per cent. respectively. Calcutta always supplied the majority of the coolies, but the death rate

[11]Reports 17, pp. 43-45; 18, pp. 50-53. Not only had immigration into Mauritius been stopped, but 1886 Indians had returned home during the first half of 1857.

[12]Report 19, pp. 45-47 and appendices 37 and 38.

thence was always higher,[13] and on the whole the planters preferred Madras laborers.[14]

Herman Merivale, for years Permanent Under-Secretary in the Colonial Office, writing just at this time (1860) pointed out that this great immigration was by no means an unmixed blessing for Mauritius. The experiment of importing coolie labor had "proceeded and prospered at such a rate as to constitute an absolutely novel phenomenon in economical history." In ten years some 150,000 coolies had been imported and the exports of Mauritius had nearly doubled in the same period. The prosperity of the island had been raised "to a pitch far exceeding what it had attained in the time of slavery." But what were the future prospects of the colony? If the coolies went home, they took their earnings with them; if they remained, an unprosperous season would throw them on charity.

> . . . In everything but the compulsion and the cruelty, the immigration trade is but a repetition of the slave trade, and the economy of Mauritius resembles that of Cuba. Such a colony is but a great workshop, rather than a miniature state. And, whenever a serious check to its prosperity occurs in the ordinary course of commercial vicissitude, it may be that this wealthy community will see cause to envy the far less brilliant but more solid fortunes of such regions as Barbadoes.[15]

As if the colony had taken Merivale's words to heart the coolie immigration to Mauritius took a very sharp drop. In 1859 the number had been 44,397; in 1860 it was but 13,286, the next year 13,985, then 9893, in 1863 5254 and in 1864 7706.[16] On the whole the emigration was very healthy, due to the sanitary measures taken by the Mauritius government and

[13] *E. g.*, in 1859 it was 2.66% for Calcutta as against 1.73% for the total.

[14] Report 20, pp. 47-49. A coolie orphan asylum was established in Mauritius for the education of the children and seemed to be quite successful.

[15] Merivale, *Lectures*, pp. 345-347.

[16] Reports 21, p. 20; 22, pp. 43-47; 23, p. 42; 24, p. 40; 25, p. 17. Calcutta still supplied about one half, Madras a third, and Bombay the remainder of the coolies.

the beneficial results of vaccinating emigrants in India.[17] In 1865 the colony tried the experiment of using permanent surgeons on the emigrant ships, instead of hiring men for one voyage as had been the previous custom. The Emigration Commissioners highly commended this step, but it did not succeed; by October 1868 all the surgeons had resigned.[18] In 1865 and 1866 the record of unusual health was broken and although Mauritius received 20,474 in 1865, the number next year fell to 5596. In 1867 the immigration was entirely suspended, due in part to the great mortality caused by the outbreak of fever, and also due to a monetary crisis and commercial depression produced by several bad crops. Merivale had been at least partly right![19]

During the last years of the Commission's life coolie emigration to Mauritius was almost negligible. In 1868, after the temporary suspension had ended, 2608 went to the colony and in 1869 only 1682. During the next three years the number of immigrants averaged 4380.[20] After that date (1872) the Commissioners' work and reports came to an end. From the close of 1842 to the end of 1872—a period of thirty years—Mauritius received 358,352 immigrants of whom 352,785 were from the East Indies. Over all this immigration the Commissioners in London had exercised a careful supervision.

[17]*Ibid.* In 1861 the average mortality was 1.52%; in 1860 Calcutta and in 1864 Bombay had unusually high rates, but these were the exceptions.

[18]Reports 26, p. 26; 29, pp. 13-15. The failure, said the Commissioners, was much to be regretted.

[19]Reports 26, pp. 19ff; 27, pp. 12ff; 28, pp. 5-7. At the same time the "old" immigrants in Mauritius became troublesome and caused much lawlessness.

[20]Reports 29, p. 9; 30, p. 17; 32, p. 13. In 1869 there were but nine deaths, an average of 0.33%!

(b) AFRICAN, INDIAN, AND CHINESE EMIGRATION TO THE WEST INDIES

Distance prevented the Emigration Commissioners from exercising any very close control over the Mauritius coolie trade; with the West Indies it was otherwise. The whole of that trade was controlled and regulated by the Board of Commissioners sitting in London; this indeed proved to be one of its most important, and most difficult, duties.

It is often not sufficiently recognized that there have been two great colonizing movements in the nineteenth century. The movement of the Europeans to fill up the manless lands of the New World has been largely advertised. But the importance of this migration of Chinese and Indian emigrants who have created new colonial values, made whole regions of the British Tropics into paying assets, and created within the British Empire a new Indian Empire in the British West Indies and a new Chinese Empire in the British Straits Settlements, has scarcely yet been recognized.[21]

The problem of an adequate labor supply had always been before the eyes of the planters in British Guiana and the West Indian islands. With the abolition of slavery this question became a very serious one. "The abundance of fertile land in British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica made it possible for the emancipated negroes to win an easy livelihood without the necessity of regular work on the plantations, and their continued withdrawal into the interior left the planters with a steadily diminishing labour force."[22] Various experiments to supply a new labor force when the system of apprenticeship ended met with failure. In 1837, following the successful

[21]Knowles, *Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire,* p. 183. See also (*ibid.,* p. viii): "Few people . . . seem to realize how important a part both Indian and Chinese emigrants have played in the development of the Empire, although the King rules over a miniature Chinese Empire in Malaya and a miniature Indian Empire in the West Indies. There have been, in fact, in the past century three mother countries of the British Empire, *i. e.,* the United Kingdom, India, and China, but the story of the two last is at present buried in numerous reports . . . "

[22]Campbell, *Chinese Coolie Emigration to Countries within the British Empire,* p. 87. See also Aspinall, *British West Indies,* p. 263; Grey, I. 63-64.

example of Mauritius, a shipload of East Indian coolies was sent to British Guiana. Other West Indian planters prepared to do likewise; but an outcry was immediately raised in parliament that it was slavery under a new guise. Then the government in India, disturbed by the stories of cruelty in the Indian emigration, prohibited further recruitment of its subjects (1839). "This for a while put a complete stop to emigration from the East to the West Indies." Attempts were then made to repair the deficiency in laborers by introducing free Africans from the smaller and more populous neighboring islands, but these "had at once associated themselves with the emancipated negroes." Encouragement was given to laborers from Madeira and Brazil "until they proved such easy victims to disease that the West Indian Government had to terminate the uncontrolled experiment." Finally the British government took a hand and proposed (1841) recruiting Africans from the Kroo Coast, but anti-slavery sentiment surrounded these proposals with so many precautions against a revival of the slave trade, that the results were negligible.[23]

By 1842 the situation had become so aggravated that the West Indian planters were in a decidedly critical position.[24] Again the home government intervened and a select committee of fifteen members was appointed, 6 April 1842, to enquire into the problem of the colonies. Three months later, at the end of July, it reported with a series of recommendations, one of which (#11) proposed that, to compensate for the diminished supply of labor, "the immigration of a fresh labouring population [be promoted] to such an extent as to create competition for employment." This immigration, it was further recommended, should be conducted under the authority, inspection, and control of responsible public officers.[25] That duty

[23]Campbell, p. 87; Aspinall, pp. 263-265; *Hansard,* LI. 1247-1250, 1310-1311.

[24]See Grey, I. 93-95.

[25]Ireland, *Tropical Colonization,* p. 154. Campbell, p. 87. Lord Stanley on 22 March 1842 had moved for two select committees, one to inquire

was entrusted to the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners. Africa was chosen as the first source of a labor supply and plans were completed for a limited emigration from Sierra Leone to the West Indies. This was "an experiment designed both to establish confidence in Africa, and also to put in operation satisfactory methods of collecting and conveying the emigrants; . . . if the results were successful, the practice might be afterwards enlarged to such a degree as might be desirable, without the intervention of the Government." Several West Indian legislatures voted the necessary funds, and three transports were sent to Sierra Leone to be employed in permanent service. The Commissioners supervised all the arrangements.[26] Simultaneously there was an emigration, not under the Board's control, between St. Helena and the West Indies, private parties taking some groups of liberated Africans. The British government became interested and sent a vessel to take some more of these former slaves; the dietary scale and the medical arrangements used on this ship were once again prepared by the Emigration Commissioners.[27]

It was further proposed to develop a third possible source of labor supply by introducing Chinese coolies from the British settlements in the Straits of Malacca.

Seeing the numerous motives for wishing to satisfy in every proper way the demand for labour in the West Indies, and considering that the more intelligent the class of people introduced, as well as the better able to protect their own interests, the more

into the state of the West Indies and the other to inquire into the state of the British possessions on the west coast of Africa. *Hansard,* LXI. 1092-1108.

[26]Report 1843, pp. 38-40. The Commissioners' instructions to the lieutenants in charge of the transports and to the surgeons on board are given *ibid.*, appendix 10.—Permission to take laborers from Africa had first been granted in 1840, and for three years (1840-2) private enterprise carried on the trade, some 4045 Africans being introduced into the West Indies. Towards the end of 1842 the immigration ceased as no further laborers were available. Representatives of the islands then proposed that the English government should employ its transports in a permanent trade between the west coast of Africa and the Caribbean. Report 5.

[27]Report 1843, pp. 40-41.

beneficial it must be to all concerned, it seems very desirable that the present experiment should be tried, and that it should be practically ascertained whether China may be added to the fields from which to attempt to furnish means for the successful cultivation of sugar by free labour.[28]

The cautious Chinese, however, insisted upon contracts before sailing, and although details of an emigration system were carefully discussed in the Colonial Office and rules drawn up, no Chinese came.[29] Not until fifteen years later was China again turned to as one of the "mother countries" of the British Empire—and again without much success.

For the early years, then, Africa was the sole source of labor immigration and, as we have seen, two experiments were under way from Sierra Leone and St. Helena. For the former the Commissioners, early in 1843, had engaged three transports, one each for Jamaica, British Guiana and Trinidad.[30] The first shipload left in April of that year, followed by eight others within the next twelvemonth, carrying a total of 666 Africans. Despite the fact that the voyages were "singularly exempt from mortality" the beginning of the experiment could not be regarded as very successful since the number of Africans obtained was so inconsiderable—an average of seventy-three for the nine ships.[31] Prospects for the future, however, were brighter; the experiment was continued, more laborers were secured, and by the time each transport had made five trips 1519 had been conveyed—an average of 101 per ship. Everything was done to increase still further the migration from Sierra Leone, but with little success.[32] An

[28]*Ibid.*, pp. 41-42. "The Chinese seem to be by far the most industrious and most hardy of oriental labourers."

[29]Report 1844, p. 26.

[30]In C.O. 386/155, p. 103 there is a copy of the Commissioners' advertisement of 5 January 1843 calling for three ships of 340 to 450 tons, all of A1 rating (Lloyd's).

[31]Report 1843, pp. 38-40.

[32]*Hansard,* LXXIII. 1355-1356. About this time the continuance of lieutenants of the navy on board the transports, in addition to the surgeons appointed by the Commissioners, was judged inexpedient and they were relieved. Report 5.

attempt to get emigrants from Gambia proved fruitless.[33] The Commissioners considered the possibility of using a steamship in the service, but concluded that it offered no sufficient advantage; it was not suited for the work and would be too expensive. As prospects for any great increase of the Sierra Leone emigration were faint, the use of the transports was discontinued in 1845 at the request of the local authorities; the supply of the emigrants was too uncertain to warrant the permanent use of the vessels. During the period they were employed the transports had landed 2187 in the West Indian colonies.[34] In August of 1845 a new system under private enterprise was put into operation but like its predecessor was not very successful; in 1846 only 129 were secured from Sierra Leone.

Meanwhile a regular trade had been established in liberated slaves from the second African colony, St. Helena. The three sugar colonies, Jamaica, British Guiana and Trinidad, appointed an agent in the island and offered bounties of £7 per adult for the last two colonies and £7.7 for the first (one-half the sum for children). As in the case of the Sierra Leone emigration, all ships carrying these Africans had a surgeon on board and were subject to the Passengers Act and the supervision of the Emigration Board.[35] To make up for the deficiency from Sierra Leone a scheme of emigration from the Kroo Coast was also tested. The project was in the nature of an experiment conducted under the immediate superintendence of the Emigration Commissioners, and originally was not intended to extend beyond one year "by which time it would

[33]No emigrants could be obtained for the reason that there was a lack of labor at Gambia, not a surplus. *Ibid.*

[34]During the years 1843-1845 one transport had made seven voyages, another six, and the third five. Reports 1844, 5 and 6.

[35]Reports 1844, pp. 17-26; 5, pp. 22ff. The Commissioners tried vaccination before the voyage, but with very little success at first.—The "liberated Africans" were negroes taken from captured slavers and landed at St. Helena.

be ascertained whether voluntary emigration was likely to take place from Africa."[36] The Royal Navy steamer *Growler* was fitted out and sent to the African coast to be used alternately for British Guiana and Trinidad. The ship made two voyages during 1847, but the mortality was so great that the government determined to discontinue its use and tried yet another scheme.[37]

The new plan was to send private ships to get liberated Africans from Sierra Leone or emigrants from the Kroo Coast. Ten vessels were engaged under contract, four each for Jamaica and British Guiana and two for Trinidad. Each ship carried as surgeon-superintendent a naval officer who received a fee of £150. At first the ship-owner was guaranteed a minimum number of Africans, but after a short time the Commissioners were "instructed to discontinue the giving any guarantee against a failure of emigrants." The expenses of the conveyance of liberated Africans from the "African yard" to the West Indies, it was decided, were to be defrayed from British funds at rates of payment not exceeding the bounties hitherto authorized. The bounty on Kroomen, however, was still to be paid by the importing colony. High mortality on some of the first vessels employed under this plan caused much worry and led the Commissioners to take increased precautions. Originally the surgeon-superintendent on board had been nominated by the shipowner; henceforth he was appointed by the Commissioners, as in the Australian ships. The mortality then decreased and before long was less than 1½ per cent. The first fourteen vessels to leave Sierra Leone after *Growler* was discontinued carried 3176 Africans, all but one of whom were liberated slaves still under the care of government.[38] For several years this emigration continued from Sierra Leone but ceased in 1851.[39] The Kroo Coast was then tried again

[36]Hawes in the Commons, 19 February 1847. *Hansard,* XC. 248-249.
[37]Reports 7 and 8. The importing colony paid a bounty on the Kroomen.
[38]Report 9.
[39]Report 12, p. 54.

and a small number of laborers secured,[40] but the government soon found it necessary to put a stop to all emigration from that district. Slavery had not existed in the Kroo Coast when negroes were first taken thence (1847), but a war had now developed between the natives to get men to sell to the captains of the ships. At various times suggestions were made that government buy slaves in Africa to be liberated in the West Indies, but the government insisted that only free emigrants be taken, as buying slaves would only have created a new demand for them. "It was therefore [wrote Grey] the bounden duty of the Government to take care that no means of procuring immigrants for the West Indies from Africa should be adopted, which involved the purchase of slaves for that purpose, directly or indirectly. No restrictions were imposed for any other object."[41]

St. Helena had been the original source of the supply of liberated Africans sent to the West Indies. In 1844 the establishment there was temporarily broken up and liberated Africans were for a time landed at Sierra Leone. After a lapse of two years, however, the depot at St. Helena was re-opened, and for the next five years (1846-1851) the emigration continued from both colonies. Improvements which were made in the arrangements in the depots and on board ship resulted in a reduction in the expense of conveying the liberated Africans to the West Indies and a decrease in the excessive mortality on the voyage; the "health has generally been excellent, and the deaths singularly few." As in the case of Sierra Leone the expense of the emigration from St. Helena was, after 1848, borne by parliament instead of being charged to the colonial revenue. In a few years 13,500 had been sent, at the cost of the British treasury, to the West Indies "where they have proved of great service to the Planters, while the reports of the condition of these immigrants are in the highest degree satis-

[40]In 1852 there were 187 and in 1853 273. Reports 13, p. 57; 14, p. 72.
[41]Grey, I. 64-65.

factory."[42] Before the new financial arrangement was made the Africans had been divided among the colonies contributing to the support of the necessary establishments; generally the negroes landed at St. Helena were sent to Trinidad and those from Sierra Leone to the smaller islands. In 1849 a definite ratio was determined for sharing the immigrants: British Guiana 6, Trinidad 4, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Grenada and St. Kitts one each.[43]

In 1851 the immigration of liberated Africans ceased from both St. Helena and Sierra Leone, and it was not expected that there would be many in the future. No more were to be landed at St. Helena, and the Commissioners made arrangements for the prompt conveyance to the West Indies of any who might be carried to Sierra Leone. Between 1859 and 1865 there was a revival of the trade to a small extent. Up to 1862 the imperial government continued to defray the expense —a "course . . . adopted when the colonies had been suffering under a severe depression, occasioned to a certain extent by imperial legislation" (free trade). The Duke of Newcastle, however, believed it was now time for a change and a new plan came into operation April 1, 1862. Expenses of transport were to be charged to the receiving colony, leaving all the expenses incurred before embarkation to be defrayed as heretofore by the home government. After 1865 the number of Africans decreased to such an extent as to be negligible.[44]

Madeira, a Portuguese colony off the northwest African coast, supplied laborers to the sugar colonies from time to time. In 1844 proposals were first made and, although the governments of the West Indies declined to pay bounty, private

[42]*Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

[43]Report 10, pp. 44-48. In 1850 an agreement was made by the Commissioners with Messrs. Hyde, Hodge and Co. to carry out the liberated Africans; three ships were to be kept in constant use, one to Guiana, one to Trinidad and the other where needed.

[44]See Reports 18 to 28, particularly Report 22, pp. 47-54. New ratios for distribution of the Africans were prepared in 1858 and 1863.

proprietors were permitted to import Madeirese under contracts; 841 were secured in 1845. British Guiana and Trinidad then decided to offer bounty and the total for 1846 jumped to 7675, most proceeding to Guiana. St. Vincent and Grenada also decided to offer bounty (1847), but the Madeira emigration had already fallen upon evil days; the mortality was great and the colonies began to feel the pinch of funds. The emigration, which had declined to 288 in 1848, ceased altogether in the following year. It was resumed to a small extent in 1851 and 1852, reached 2567 in 1853, continued through 1854-55, slackened again in 1857 (670 only), rose once more in 1858 to 1664, and after 1867 ceased almost entirely. The Cape Verde and Azores Islands also supplied several shiploads of immigrants for the West Indies.[45]

In addition to these African sources the West Indian colonies from time to time introduced, or attempted to introduce, laborers from regions closer home. There was a certain amount of migration from island to island, and from Havana, a Spanish colony, some immigrants were obtained in the years 1845 to 1848.[46] In 1844 Jamaica appointed an agent in an ineffectual attempt to bring negroes from Canada. Some years later (1851) Trinidad named a special agent to inquire into bringing free blacks from the United States of America: again nothing developed. The Canadian idea was revived in 1858. "The suggestion that certain free blacks, now resident in Canada, might be induced to emigrate to the West Indies, has been made to the government of Jamaica . . . and Sir Edmund Head appears not to consider the scheme impracticable. As far as we are aware, however, nothing has yet been

[45]British Guiana received most of the Madeirese, 28,553 out of 34,364; of these 5,158 had been introduced prior to 1843; the colony continued to receive small numbers from Madeira down to 1871. See Reports 5-8, 10, 12-19.

[46]In 1845 224, 1846 162, 1847 81, 1848 41. Reports 7 to 9.

done towards trying the experiment."[47] British Honduras alone seems to have been successful in obtaining negroes from the north, receiving 300 from the southern States in 1867.[48] Some talk was occasionally heard of introducing European immigrants for the West Indies, but the imperial authorities discouraged any such proposals.[49]

The failure of the African sources forced the West Indian planters to depend more and more upon other fields for their labor supply. A West India Committee on July 11, 1843, sent a memorial to the Secretary of State requesting that, in addition to the more active encouragement of immigration from Africa, the right given Mauritius of reopening the Indian immigration be extended to them also. Stanley carefully considered the memorial. "But though the economic position of the planters demanded his sympathetic consideration, [he] was determined to prevent the institution of any order approximating to slavery." He would not remove the safeguards from African recruitment, nor disregard the welfare of the Indian coolies. Before taking any action he sent a dispatch (29 November 1843) asking the views of the Governor-General and Council of India on the question of allowing emigration to the West Indies. The reply, dated 13 May 1844, gave approval under certain restrictions. The existing prohibition was therefore removed and the Emigration Commissioners were instructed to prepare some general regulations for the guidance of the officers in India. The Indian government passed an act to regulate the trade, appointed a "Protector of Emigrants," and designated Calcutta and Madras as embarka-

[47]Report 19, pp. 52-53. On the earlier proposals see Reports 5 and 12. British Guiana in 1863 passed an ordinance to encourage immigration from West Indian islands and from the continent of North America. Report 24.

[48]Report 28.

[49]Reports 5, p. 33; 6, p. 52.

tion points; the emigration was to be limited to 12,500 a year.[50]

"The withdrawal of the prohibition against immigration from India was . . . hailed with delight" in the West Indies.[51] British Guiana, Jamaica and Trinidad immediately entered the field, enacting the necessary legislation and voting funds to pay the expense of introducing coolies and giving them return passages at the end of five years (which India had insisted should be granted). In June 1845 the Emigration Commissioners issued an advertisement calling for tenders for shipping and guaranteeing a full complement of coolies under forfeit. Thirty-one vessels were then engaged for the conveyance of 8000 coolies to be divided between the three colonies, British Guiana receiving the most. In the great labor movement which thus began in 1845 the Emigration Commissioners played a leading rôle. They supervised the whole emigration for the British government, advised upon all phases of it, drew up regulations, passed under review all colonial legislation upon the matter, appointed and supervised surgeons for the emigrant-ships,[52] bought coolie clothing and other supplies, and whenever necessary chartered all or some of the ships required.[53] They set the machinery of the great emigration in motion and for thirty years kept careful watch that it operated smoothly and efficiently.

No lengthy survey of this great movement can be attempted

[50]Report 5, pp. 22-23, appendices 15-17. See also *Hansard*, LXXIII. 1692.

[51]Aspinall, p. 263.

[52]In C.O. 386/9 will be found printed forms used for the appointment of the surgeon-superintendent on ships in the coolie service. His remuneration was a free cabin-passage from and to England and a gratuity for each emigrant landed alive if the colonial authorities were satisfied as to the discharge of his duties. The gratuity varied from 10/- to 20/- according to length of experience.

[53]Copies of ads for shipping will be found in C.O. 386/155, pp. 103-104. The minimum size of ships was specified, date and place of sailing, etc. Passage money was paid on arrival in the West Indies if the authorities were satisfied. The coolie "season" was from October to February.

here; statistics will be found in the appendices to give some indication of the volume of the trade carried on. Each year the three importing colonies—Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana—sent in their "orders" which the agents in India endeavored to fill, with varying success. In the early years and from time to time thereafter lack of shipping at the Indian ports was a handicap, which the Commissioners sought to overcome by hiring shipping in England. In 1847 Jamaica withdrew from the trade fearing that, "in consequence of the alteration in the sugar duties, the public revenue will no longer be able to bear this expense." The following year all emigration from India was suspended as the other two colonies also felt the pinch of funds. Since the beginning of the immigration to its termination in 1848 Jamaica had received 4500, British Guiana 11,888 and Trinidad 5403.[54]

The suspension lasted through 1849. Then at the request of British Guiana and Trinidad a plan for renewing the immigration was considered. As in the case of the African trade the British parliament came to the assistance of the financially-embarrassed colonies, voted a sum of money in 1850, and the coolie trade was resumed from Calcutta.[55] By 1856, however, the mortality in the renewed emigration was giving serious cause for alarm. The number of deaths in Calcutta ships had always been rather large, averaging 4.37 per cent. in the five years 1851-1856. In 1856-7 there was an increase to 17.26 per cent! All ships of the season were affected, but the investigations made absolved the emigration officers in Calcutta from any blame. Certain improvements, suggested by the Indian government investigator, in the sanitary precautions on board were adopted and resulted in a great decrease in the mortality for the next six or seven years. The season 1864-5, however,

[54]Report 9, pp. 33-38. See also Reports 6-8. On the whole the voyages had been healthy, but as in the case of Mauritius the Madras coolies were healthier than the Calcutta, though the latter were preferred by the planters.

[55]It was at this time that China was turned to as another source of labor.

showed another high death rate, which caused considerable worry to the Commissioners although all investigations again held the emigration authorities to be blameless. For the remainder of the period of the Board's supervision the health of the emigrants gave no further cause for alarm.[56]

Meanwhile other colonies had entered the coolie immigration field. Jamaica returned in 1858; Grenada secured a few shiploads in the years after 1856; two years later St. Lucia ordered two ships of coolies and continued to order small quantities from time to time; in 1861 both St. Kitts and St. Vincent began importation. By 1863, however, all of these had suspended their trade leaving British Guiana and Trinidad alone to continue; St. Vincent and Jamaica returned to the field three years later. In 1872 the colonies importing Indians were British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica regularly, St. Vincent every other year and Grenada occasionally. When the time came in 1878 for the Emigration Board to close its books Walcott wrote to the two firms engaged in the coolie trade, G. D. Tyser & Co. and Sandbach, Tinnie & Co., informing them that the duties hitherto performed by the Board in connection with the emigration from India to the British West Indies would in future be discharged by the Crown Agents for the Colonies. Tyser & Co. expressed their "great regret that we shall not be able to carry out our contracts under the management of your Board, where we have always experi-

[56]See Reports 10 to 32. In October 1860 the Commissioners transferred to the coolie trade a number of the surgeons formerly employed in the Australian service which was now decreasing. The results of this move were on the whole most satisfactory; in 1861-3 the health was decidedly improved—the unfortunate year 1864-5 was the exception, for which the surgeons were not held responsible. See Reports 22-24. When the Commons on one occasion raised some questions about the coolie trade Adderley, then Parliamentary Under-Secretary, defended the system and the Commissioners. Mr. Cardwell supported him: "This system was superintended by some of the ablest public servants which this country possessed—namely, the Emigration Commissioners." *Hansard,* CLXXXV. 1246-1259; March 1, 1867.

enced the greatest consideration and courtesy." The Commissioner also wrote to the Secretaries of British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica, informing them that in consequence of his retirement the Emigration Board would cease to exist as a separate department after March 31 of that year. "As regards the conduct of the business relating to the Coolie Emigration from India, I have received Sir Michael Hicks Beach's directions to transfer to the Crown Agents for the Colonies all the shipping and other arrangements which hitherto have been carried on by this Board. I have accordingly handed over to them for their guidance the contract entered into by us on behalf of the colonial government for the supply of shipping for the conveyance of coolies and the forms of Charter Parties and other documents used by us in this service."[57]

Merivale in 1860 had criticized the importation of coolie labor into the Mauritius islands; at the same time he examined the situation in the West Indies.

> No free labourers have been imported in any numbers worth mentioning, except into the two . . . colonies [British Guiana and Trinidad]. It appears, therefore, that the benefit of the system, to the West Indies in general, has been of a very limited description. . . . On the whole, these colonies appear to have regained, by the application of imported labour, about the same amount of productiveness which they possessed before emancipation; but hardly as yet to have exceeded it.[58]

The third and final field of labor supply was China. Years before, on 11 July 1843, the West India Committee had memorialized Secretary Stanley requesting that immigration from Africa be encouraged and Indian immigration be opened. No reply had been received when the Committee a few days later, 14 July, applied for permission to introduce Chinese coolies on contract from the Straits Settlements, pointing out

[57]C.O. 386/2. C.O. 384/112 and 121. The purchase of coolie clothing, hire of surgeons and other financial duties were transferred to the Agents in January 1877. See C.O. 384/120 for an exchange of compliments between Walcott and Mitchell, the Emigration Agent for Trinidad.

[58]Merivale, *Lectures,* p. 344.

the great need of the West Indian colonies.[59] The Colonial Secretary gave the proposal close consideration; the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners sent questions to gentlemen of experience in China and collected evidence and opinions. Permission was eventually granted and arrangements made for a contract emigration under license. Some licenses were actually issued but no Chinese were introduced for the reason that they were no longer needed. The government of India had acceded to Stanley's request to permit coolie emigration to the West Indies and a regulated movement of Indian laborers had commenced under government control.[60]

Not until the free trade crisis of 1846-1849 was the subject of Chinese labor reopened. "From this time forward the remedy of immigration, the one chance that remained, was seized on and pursued with rare tenacity and vigour."[61] All African and Portuguese immigration was for the time being shut off, but the necessity of both Indian and Chinese immigration was fully discussed and various investigations and proposals were made (1849-52). After information had been gathered from several sources, Mr. White, who had been sent from Guiana to Calcutta, "was directed to proceed to China and ascertain on the spot what steps should be taken for obtaining labourers from that country." He presented a very able report on the subject, and obtained offers from mercantile houses for the conveyance of Chinese to the West Indies.[62] There were, however, several obstacles to be overcome. Chinese law forbade a Chinese subject to emigrate without a special permit. Despite this restriction a contract trade had

[59]Campbell, pp. 89-90. There are two invaluable aids for the study of this phase of the topic: Campbell (particularly Chapter III) and Clementi, *The Chinese in British Guiana.* Clementi was at one time Assistant Colonial Secretary of Hong Kong and later Government Secretary of British Guiana. See also Knowles, *Economic Development,* pp. 183ff.

[60]Campbell, p. 91.

[61]*Ibid.,* pp. 92-93.

[62]Grey, I. 67-68.

grown up around the port of Amoy; but the methods pursued in recruiting the coolies—fraud, brutality, deceit, riot, murder—and the high mortality on the voyage caused great resentment in China and presented a second difficulty to getting sanction for the establishment of a government-conducted trade. When the British ministry finally gave its permission to British Guiana and Trinidad, the Emigration Commissioners communicated with the West India Committee (October 1851) and made arrangements for a contract system of emigration under government control, which meant, of course, under the supervision of the Board. The Commissioners contracted with Hyde, Hodge & Company to supply the necessary shipping and appointed Mr. White as Government Emigration Agent at Hong Kong "to supervise the bounty emigration already in operation, and, as the opportunity offered, to establish a permanent system of emigration under Government control."

In their instructions (23 October 1852) the Commissioners urged him to secure as large a proportion of females as possible, and also a suitable number of interpreters. They reminded him that H. M. Government had authorized the expenditure of public money on this scheme on the undertaking that the Chinese law forbidding the emigration of Chinese subjects had fallen into desuetude. Should it prove otherwise, Mr. White was immediately to desist from all operations carried on by him in his official capacity. The British Government was not prepared to allow the contravention of a Chinese law if it had present force and effect.[63]

High hopes were entertained by every one for the success of this emigration, but they were not soon to be realized. White arrived at Amoy to find the competition in coolies very keen. Before long the public indignation against the methods of "pig-dealing" caused outbreaks in the port and led to investigations by the British government and objections by the Chinese authorities to the traffic in coolies. "Not only had the evils of the contract system aroused the antagonism of the Chinese population of Amoy. By so arousing antagonism the coolie-business had seriously interfered with the legitimate

[63]Campbell, p. 100; see also Clementi, pp. 27-31; Reports 12 *et seq.*

commerce." As a result of these November disturbances the British officials in China were instructed to act in strict conformity with treaty-rights, and neither directly nor indirectly aid in the shipment of Chinese subjects should that government object to emigration. But if the coolies were willing to go it was up to the Chinese government to enforce its own laws.[64] With Amoy practically closed to emigration the private coolie trade moved to non-treaty ports. White was unable to do that and endeavored, without much success, to build up a system of government-supervised contract emigration from the port of Hong Kong.

Despite this inauspicious beginning the West Indian colonies expressed their desire to continue the trade. The Commissioners accordingly had conferences with White, who had returned to England in the spring of 1853, and with other gentlemen acquainted with China. They decided that the private bounty system of securing coolies must be terminated and that "all future emigration under contract to the British West Indies should be conducted by a Government official"; collisions with the Chinese people or authorities must henceforth be avoided, and emigrants must be embarked from treaty ports only. To further regulate the coolie trade parliament, at the suggestion of the Commissioners, passed an amendment to the Passengers Act of 1852.[65] The Emigration Board then appointed White as Emigration Agent in China for the next season, instructing him to make Hong Kong his headquarters but leaving him discretionary power to have recourse to Amoy if such a course were practicable and necessary.[66] But White again found

[64]Campbell, pp. 102-103.

[65]*Hansard,* CXXIX. 1706. The act (16&17 Vict., c.84; 20 August 1853) was quite brief, authorizing the change in ratio from one passenger to 15 superficial feet to one passenger to 12 feet in the case of natives of Africa and Asia. See also Clementi and Campbell.

[66]Campbell, p. 108. P.P. ♯255 (1855). C.O. 386/90. The cost of the contract emigration was to be defrayed in part by a tax on the employers of Chinese labor.

difficulty in securing shipping from Hong Kong and allowed some vessels to sail from Amoy and Namoa, the latter a *non*-treaty port. The Commissioners "regretted" the occurrence, but the Foreign Office remonstrated so strongly against this disobedience of orders that when White returned to England in June 1854 he was not reappointed.

No coolies were embarked from China in the years between 1854 and 1858 and the prospects were very poor.[67] Emigration was much frowned upon at the open or treaty ports; there was no surplus population at Hong Kong; the previous coolie emigration had no official Chinese sanction; it had been entirely male: these were some of the many problems that had to be faced and solved if possible. Much as the Commissioners regretted these difficulties they were not prepared to advise that Chinese emigration should be discontinued;[68] British Guiana for her part was insistent on getting more laborers. The result was that when Lord Elgin went out to China in 1857 on a diplomatic mission he was instructed to attempt to secure a formal sanction for the emigration of Chinese men and women. At the same time the Guiana government sent a Mr. Austin to collect information, while the planters suggested that the British government sanction a temporary immigration under private enterprise. Lord Stanley agreed to this for one year, authorizing ordinances in both Guiana and Trinidad under which private persons could import Chinese laborers under contract for three years.[69] Two ships were sent but "their recruitment and shipment [was] effected in a manner so irregular as to call forth adverse comment from the Colonial Office, the Emigration Commissioners, and the Governor of British Guiana." Then famine appeared in China and prospects for

[67]Report 16 (pp. 40-42) said that resumption was unlikely as the emigration had not been very satisfactory.

[68]Campbell, p. 111.

[69]The Commissioners prepared a draft ordinance which was approved by Stanley and sent to the colony of British Guiana where it became law 10 July 1858. Clementi, pp. 57-59.

the West Indian emigration seemed better. But Newcastle, who had succeeded Stanley, was quite unmoved by the humanitarian arguments of the Commissioners to permit a government emigration, insisting that a solution to the male problem must first be found. As a result the experiment of contract emigration was suspended for another year.

The experiments of the fifties had shown only too conclusively that Chinese emigration under contract to the British dominions, when conducted by private enterprize, was subject to the same abuses as that directed to other foreign countries. But there were too many British interests involved in the affairs of China for the British Government to sanction a traffic that was rousing an ugly temper in the populace of the seaports. The contract system must be established on a new basis if it was to continue in operation.[70]

The year 1859 proved to be the turning-point in the history of Chinese emigration. Foreign countries had been looking more and more to China as a source of labor supply, and the abuses of the traffic were increasing with competition. "Crimps" and brutality became the rule. An angry fear developed in the populace of Canton, kidnappers were killed by the mobs, and European naval commanders were forced to take action. Governor Peh-Kwei of Kwangtung province issued a proclamation, 9 April 1859, forbidding kidnapping on pain of death but allowing voluntary emigration. "Thus law and tradition were alike set aside."[71] The proclamation having opened the way, the British government at once adopted a policy of active intervention in the coolie traffic from the Chinese seaports. Upon the receipt of favorable reports from Austin, the British Guiana investigator, the colony ordered 2200 Chinese to be sent. A scheme proposed by Austin and sanctioned by the Colonial Office was formally submitted to the Chinese provincial authorities for approval (October 1859). Recruitment by Chinese crimps was to be abandoned and

[70]Campbell, p. 114. See also Report 19. In 1855 a "Chinese Passengers Act" had been passed by the British parliament (18&19 Vict., c.104), but comparatively few ships complied with it.

[71]Campbell, pp. 115-120.

replaced by voluntary emigration under the direct supervision of Chinese officials. A British Emigration House was to be established on shore with every facility for ingress and egress, and placed under the joint supervision of a Chinese official and the British agent, who were also to control and inspect the shipping used. A coolie's wife and children were to receive free passages without being obliged to enter into any contract of service. These proposals were accepted by the Governor-General, October 26, and announced in a proclamation. Austin at once put his plans into operation and opened the Emigration House two weeks later.[72]

The Governor-General subsequently extended these regulations to cover all emigration under contract and took steps to suppress the collection of coolies except through government houses. The French and Spanish thereupon opened establishments. There was always the possibility, however, that the Chinese imperial government might overrule its subordinate and turn hostile to all emigration. To guard against this Mr. Bruce, the British Minister to China, urged Lord Russell to consider the matter in concert with the French and Spanish governments, and Lord Elgin was instructed to insert a clause in the Convention of Peking which sanctioned voluntary emigration from China for service in British territories and admitted the necessity for regulating such emigration.[73]

A regulated system of Chinese emigration under contract to the British West Indies was thus established in 1859, and extended in the two following years by sub-agencies at Swatow and Amoy. From Canton in the season 1859-60 Austin sent six ships with 1973 on board (80 per cent. male). The health at first was good, so the most favorable expectations were

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 123. Report 20, pp. 49-53 is full of praise for Austin and Parkes, the British Commissioner at Canton, for the successful manner in which they overcame all difficulties, satisfied the Chinese authorities, and got the trade under way.

[73] Campbell, p. 128. For other phases of the diplomatic negotiations going on at this time, see *Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy*, II. 422-429.

entertained and ten ships chartered for the next season, five in England and five in China. The ships were duly dispatched with 3496 Chinese, but the mortality was higher than the previous year. The ill-will of the Chinese people and opposition of the mandarins were still in evidence, and the trade began to decline almost as soon as it had commenced. For 1861-62 there were but eight ships, seven to Guiana and the other to Trinidad (which had now entered the field); the total number of Chinese was 3057. Five ships were chartered in London by the Commissioners for 1862-63, but only one was sent from China (with 413), and but one the following year (with 503). The trade was proving too expensive, so the two importing colonies, Trinidad and Guiana, agreed, as a measure of economy, to combine operations and order 2000 coolies a year for the next three seasons (1250 to Guiana and 750 to Trinidad). At the same time Sampson, who had replaced Austin, was instructed to reduce his establishment as much as possible.[74] Under the new scheme British Guiana in 1864-65 received 1766, Trinidad 612, and Honduras 480 Chinese; in 1865-66 the numbers were but 796 and 611 for Guiana and Trinidad. There the emigration abruptly ceased, for the Chinese government had intervened.[75]

The authorities at Peking had insisted upon a careful supervision of the contract terms under which the coolies were employed and a fixed responsibility for their fulfilment.[76] To this end negotiations were opened between the governments of China, Great Britain and France, and an emigration con-

[74]Reports 20, pp. 49-53; 21, pp. 17-22; 22, pp. 47-54; 23, pp. 42-43; 24, pp. 41-47; 25, pp. 27-28. Campbell, p. 130. When Austin retired in 1862 because of ill-health, Murdoch sent a letter of appreciation (9 December 1862): the agent had done good service and his exertions and arrangements had placed the emigration on a much sounder footing than that on which it stood before his appointment. Clementi, pp. 139-140.

[75]Reports 26, pp. 19-26; 27, pp. 16-20. For the first year Guiana had increased her quota to 1800, but reduced it the next year to 1250.

[76]Campbell, p. 140. For a description of laboring conditions in the West Indian colonies, see *ibid.*, pp. 131-139.

vention was drawn up, March 5, 1866. While the provisions of 1859 were almost entirely retained, the new convention had a larger scope; it limited the period of contract to five years and stipulated that at the end of that time the coolie was to receive a free return passage or a sum of money equal thereto. The West India Committee had immediately protested against the free return passage clause (June 8), and the British government refused to ratify the convention. At the request of the Foreign Office (October 20) the Commissioners explained the various objections to the convention and drafted an alternative set of regulations. Their views were supported by the Committee and by the two colonies, Guiana and Trinidad.[77] Meanwhile the French government, which also had refused to ratify the Chinese terms, suggested through its ambassador in London that a joint note be sent to Peking (June 30). After protracted correspondence between the two governments pressure was finally brought to bear on the Tsungli Yamen; but China defied both powers, rejected a draft treaty submitted by them (1868), refused to go back to the provisions of 1859 and insisted on the convention of 1866 which it had signed. Despite the strongest arguments the Yamen refused to yield. When instructions were sent to inform the Chinese that contract emigration would be resumed under the old regulations (21 September 1868), the Viceroy at Canton replied that he had positive orders not to permit emigration except under the convention of 1866. "Short of force there was nothing further to be done," and the British government agreed it was useless to continue discussions on the subject.[78]

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 142. Reports 27 to 33. The Commissioners summed up the situation when they pointed out that the new Chinese conditions would "very largely increase the expense of the emigration and make it dearer than the emigration of Indian coolies." It became, therefore, "a question whether the colonies of British Guiana and Trinidad would think it worth while to continue the emigration under such circumstances." Clementi, pp. 207-208.

[78] Campbell, pp. 143-149. In 1860-1 the British when negotiating with

Contract emigration from Chinese ports ended therefore in 1866, and the Chinese government refused to give in, despite the anxiety of British Guiana and Trinidad to renew an emigration so valuable to them. When the British agency was reopened in February 1873 with a proposal of five year contracts and $50 for return passage, both the Yamen and the Foreign Office disapproved. There was now a widespread demand in both China and Britain for a final cessation of the whole business. Portugal in 1874 closed the port of Macao to contract emigration, and as far as the Chinese ports were concerned the government effectively stopped the trade by its demand for guarantees.

For a further supply of Chinese coolies the planters of British West Indian colonies were thus forced to rely on the operation of the contract system at Hong Kong. But the opposition of the Foreign Office to a continuation of Chinese contract emigration and the pressure of public opinion aroused by the Anti-Slavery Society in Great Britain were effective, and the British West India Emigration Agency, the activities of which had been suspended since 1874, was finally closed down.[79]

One final matter in which the Emigration Commission was concerned may be referred to. The French government wished to secure permission to recruit coolies from British India for labor in her colonies; negotiations were opened and Sir Frederic Rogers, one of the Commissioners, spent a considerable part of 1858 and 1859 in Paris treating with the French representatives for terms. He has left some interesting notes concerning his work.

France for an Indian convention insisted on a five year contract and return passages. When the Yamen in 1866 demanded the same terms the British declared them "unacceptable and inadmissible"!

[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 151-159. To the end of 1872 the West Indian colonies had received 16,222 from China. Report 33, appendix 11. "But the experiment of introducing Chinese labour, though generally successful as a temporary economic expedient, failed to have a permanent social value, for the reason that 'it was neither initiated nor pursued in the interests of colonization.'" Campbell, p. 160.

The English nation, while its own interests are not very visibly and gravely concerned, has a strong vein of philanthropy, but it is in regard to negro slavery that this feeling has so taken hold of the people, and is so powerfully organised as to become a political influence. Partly on this account and partly also, I doubt not, from genuine conviction, Lord Palmerston had taken up this particular question, and felt himself bound to assist, if possible, certain plans of the French Government for conducting an immigration from the West coast of Africa to the French negro colonies, which was supposed to have hitherto covered a disguised slave trade. The French Government, pressed by its planters, did not venture simply to suppress this, and, I take it for granted, replied to a remonstrance by pointing to our own coolie emigration (which it had for some time been my special function to superintend). At any rate, Lord Palmerston, then Premier, and Lord Clarendon, then at the Foreign Office, suggested to the French that, if they would give up their African emigration, they might be allowed to take coolies from India to their colonies on the same terms (mutatis mutandis) as those on which they were taken to English colonies. Neither the India Office, nor the Colonial Office, much liked this arrangement, because it appeared probable that, since we had not been more than able to protect the coolies in our own colonies, we should be less than able to protect them in those of France; and so the evil of quasi-slavery might exist, the responsibility of it merely being transferred from the Foreign Office (which was bound to protect the Africans) to us, or rather to the India Office, which was bound to protect the Indians.

However, the first step was that the French should understand what would be the terms to which the planters would be bound to submit in importing coolies from India, and I was bidden to call on Persigny. . . . The negotiations were interrupted when the French war in Italy was imminent. . . . However, it was taken up again after the conclusion of the war, and I was again sent to Paris to proceed with the convention—this time with M. de Chasseloup Loubat. He was a talkative, quick, handy fellow, and we got through the work rapidly and in a friendly way. . . . The convention was some time after concluded, as I had settled it; I imagine, with scarcely an alteration.[80]

The convention, signed at Paris on 1 July 1861, authorized the French government to appoint an agent to direct the operation of emigration to the French colonies. All facilities afforded to the recruiting agents for British colonies were to

[80]Notes by Rogers, quoted in Marindin, pp. 170-172.

be extended to the French agent, who, on the other hand, was required to conform to the regulations which then existed or might be established for the recruitment of laborers for British colonies.[81]

[81]Report 22, pp. 53-54. See also C.O. 384/104.—From 1866 to 1871 parliament made annual votes to defray the "expenses connected with the emigration of coolies from India to French Colonies"; the sums were 1866—£5824, 1867—£1100, 1868—£1200, 1869—£500, 1870—£600, 1871—£700. *Commons Journals,* CXXI. 491; CXXII. 389; CXXIII. 126, 274; CXXIV. 379; CXXV. 385; CXXVI. 426.

X

COLONIAL LANDS AND MISCELLANEOUS DUTIES

"COLONIAL LAND." To treat this phase of the Commission's work in any detail would require a whole dissertation in itself. The only alternative is to discuss it in a very summary fashion, but this, after all, may give a fairly good picture of the nature of the work performed. In brief the "Colonial Land" part of the Commission's activities amounted to advice and legislative review. In the early years the Commissioners had, indeed, been empowered to sell Australasian colonial lands in the United Kingdom and had employed agents throughout the country for that purpose, paying them 2½ per cent. commission on their sales.[1] It was hardly to be expected, however, that purchasers would wish to buy at sight unseen, and the sales were quite inconsiderable.[2] In 1842 with the passage of the Waste Lands Act the direct sale of lands in England ceased. This act, while upholding the principle that the proceeds of land sales were the exclusive property of the imperial government, ruled that this revenue was to be regarded as a trust for the benefit of the colony which produced it. All Crown lands were to be sold at auction with a fixed minimum price of £1 per acre; the proceeds were to be divided into two parts, one-half to the support of immigration to that colony, the other half for surveys, improvement of communications, and protection of the aborigines.[3] Some

[1]The South Australian Commissioners, who first had sold colonial lands in England, had paid 5%; but late in 1840, after the amalgamation of the two Commissions, the rate was reduced to 2½%. The agents for selling land were also used to select emigrants for free passages. See C.O. 384/71; C.O. 386/155.

[2]Up to July 1842 £12,260; 1842 £2340; 1843 £600. Reports 1842, pp. 10-11; 1844, p. 10.

[3]5&6 Vict., c.36. On the complex history of Australian lands see Epps, *Land Systems of Australia,* and Jenks, *The History of the Australasian Colonies from their Foundation to the Year 1893.*

years later, in the decade of the '50s, as the various Australian colonies were given self-government the colonists finally received what they wanted—full control of their own lands.

As a land-selling agency the Commission was not important, but from the date of its creation, 10 January 1840, to its abolition in March 1878, the Board served as *the* reporter, counsellor, and adviser of the Colonial Office upon all matters pertaining to lands in all the colonies. The years between 1840 and 1855 in particular were taken up with complaints or claims concerning land grants; these came directly to the Colonial Office, or were referred to it from the colonial authorities or from another department,[4] but all of them went in the end to the Commissioners for their report; and almost invariably that report was minuted in the Colonial Office: "Prepare the draft of a dispatch in this sense."[5] For example, by 1840 the affairs of New Zealand had fallen into that tangle which so perplexes her early history. The British government was attempting to straighten out with the New Zealand Company the claims of the aborigines and the confusion of land regulations. "Every paper connected with the proceedings was sent home, and the whole of them were made . . . the subject of an elaborate investigation at our office." The Commissioners proposed solutions to the various difficulties and prepared the terms for an agreement with the Company.[6] Later during the protracted negotiations they were called upon to investigate the accounts of the Nanto Bordelaise Company, a French settlement on Middle Island, and assisted in adjusting its claims.[7]

In addition to these land claims, all colonial acts, ordinances or regulations concerning lands, pasturage licenses, mines or mineral rights, and kindred matters were, as an almost invariable rule, sent to the Emigration Board for examination and

[4]*E. g.*, complaints concerning land grants to pensioners, referred from the War Office.

[5]See C.O. 384 and C.O. 386 *passim.*

[6]Report 1843, pp. 20-24, and appendix 8.

[7]See Reports 5 and 6.

were confirmed or disallowed as they recommended. For example, on 26 May 1842 a measure concerning Crown lands in New South Wales was referred to the Commissioners. They reported: "We have the honor to state that we do not perceive any reason why the Act should not be confirmed"; to which Stephen added: "I apprehend that the Governor should be informed that the Queen has been advised to confirm and allow this Act," and a dispatch was sent off to Gipps accordingly.[8] Later in the year an ordinance of the New Zealand governor and council concerning land claims came to the Board; in their report they reviewed the situation in detail, and recommended disallowance of the ordinance and the revival of the previously established law. "Act to be disallowed accordingly. S[tanley]."[9] In 1857 the colony of Natal proposed some new land regulations; on the advice of the Commissioners, who held that the new system would practically be a recurrence to free grants and would give rise to many evils, approval was withheld and the old practice of sale by auction was restored.[10] Cases could be cited almost endlessly, but it may be said that in general the colonial legislation was allowed, sometimes even against the better judgment of the Commissioners. Two cases in point occurred in 1858 and 1861. In the former year some land laws of Tasmania were left to their operation although the Board felt serious doubts as to their evils.[11] Three years later the colony of Natal established colleges at Pietermaritzburg and D'Urban and passed acts endowing them with land. These last measures did not meet with full approval. "Lands thus held are a great impediment to the progress of the neighbourhood, and a serious evil to the settlers, and it would therefore have been better if some other means of endowing the

[8]C.O. 384/71.

[9]*Ibid.* For other New Zealand cases see, *inter alia*, C.O. 386/73, pp. 393-425; and C.O. 386/75, pp. 32-40. New Zealand with her numerous provinces gave the Board a great deal of reporting to do.

[10]Reports 18, p. 48, appendices 42-44; 19, p. 45, and appendix 36.

[11]Report 19, pp. 33ff.

colleges had been adopted. But upon the whole it has been decided to leave the Acts for the present to their operation, although the attention of the Lieutenant-Governor has been called to the objections to which they are open."[12]

In addition to the review of colonial legislation relating to land, the Colonial Land and Emigration Board had the duty of reporting upon all economic legislation in general from the various colonies. Some specific instances will best illustrate the nature of this work. There are among the papers of the Board several volumes containing the "Register" of West Indian correspondence; this lists forty-seven acts, bills, and ordinances reported upon by the Commissioners between 1853 and 1857 (inclusive),[13] sixty-five between 1858 and 1861,[14] and twenty-five between 1862 and 1863.[15] The nature of the report is not always indicated but disallowance seldom appears (one, four and no cases in each of the three periods); some are recommended for alteration or amendment (four, eleven and one); specific confirmation is noted in nine, thirty-one and nineteen instances.[16] One case may be quoted. Bermuda in 1862 passed an act to promote immigration by bounties of £6 to £9. Murdoch in reporting on the act pointed out one or two omissions, but recommended approval with the suggestion that the attention of the governor be drawn to these points. Two years later an act was passed to repeal the first and establish a new system. The Commissioner found a serious objection to the new measure and recommended suspension of approval until the objection was removed; when the colony had passed the necessary legislation approval was given.[17]

[12]Report 22, p. 58. The history of the Clergy Reserves in Upper Canada supports the Commissioners' arguments.

[13]Many of the reports were signed by Rogers alone, who had that particular duty (*vide supra*). Of the reports between 1853 and 1857 the majority were of the year 1856.

[14]Principally of 1858.

[15]No reports listed after March 1863.

[16]C.O. 428/2, 3 and 4.

[17]Murdoch to Elliot, 31 January 1863, 5 July 1865, and 28 February 1866. C.O. 386/85, pp. 269, 372-373, 428-432.

Commissioner Wood was once instructed to report upon a South Australian act of March 1856 concerning the collection and distribution of duties levied upon goods intended for New South Wales and Victoria but carried in by way of the River Murray in South Australia. Wood explained the purpose of the measure, pointed out that there had been some friction between the governor and his council, and concluded that, since the governor promised a further report on the subject, the Colonial Secretary (Labouchere) could withhold his opinion.[18] Of two Western Australian acts reported on in August 1842, one provided for the retention in the colony for at least two years of laborers imported at government expense; the Commissioners objected and could not "recommend that the present act should be allowed." The second measure was to provide for accurate surveys; the Board in recommending allowance expressed their cordial concurrence. "Concur? GWH.—Concur. S." The minutes upon the report indicate that the reply sent to the governor of the colony used the Commissioners' arguments *verbatim,* simply changing the wording so as to read as Stanley's expression of opinion.[19]

One final instance. Newfoundland passed an act for the reduction of pauperism by encouraging agriculture. An appropriation of $20,000 was to be made for each of the next two years, the sum to be paid to "poor persons" for tilling land. Murdoch commented on the unusual character of the act and its "doubtful expediency." The money would only be wasted; if the people were paupers to begin with, how were they to support themselves? The bounty—$8 for the first acre cleared, tilled and cultivated and $6 for every other acre up to six—was too small to live on; what would happen at the end of the two years? He was "very doubtful whether this Act should be confirmed," and believed the money would be better spent on public works. Lord Carnarvon wrote in this sense to the

[18]Wood to Merivale, 31 December 1856. C.O. 384/96.

[19]Commrs. to G. W. Hope, 18 August 1842. C.O. 384/71. This was the usual procedure.

government of Newfoundland and the Executive Council replied. The letter was referred to Murdoch for report. He still believed his arguments to be correct, but, as the legislature stood by the law after knowing the objections to it, he suggested that it was unnecessary to carry any further resistance to the act.[20]

Another branch of the Commission's work was the execution of guano licenses and the collection of the rents therefrom. Late in 1855 Merivale, in a confidential letter, informed the Commissioners that the Foreign Office proposed granting Captain Ord a lease for five years of the Kooria Mooria Islands for the export of guano to the United Kingdom. They were directed to communicate with Ord, arrange terms and prepare a draft of the lease. After long correspondence this was done and the lessees began work. The trade, however, was disappointing and, although the royalty was reduced, Ord and his associates were unable to meet their obligations. In 1861 the license was cancelled and a new agreement executed by the Commissioners with Dixon & Co. of Liverpool.[21] As other islands and companies were now coming into the field the Board was instructed to prepare a blank form of license granting exclusive rights for seven years to export guano at a royalty of two shillings per ton for the first two years and four shillings for the remainder of the term. The Secretary of State was empowered to cancel the license on political

[20]Murdoch to Elliot, 8 August and 11 December 1866. C.O. 386/85, pp. 445-448, 461-466. On another occasion a Newfoundland act concerning the Crown lands was criticized, amended and then allowed. Report 6, p. 29.

[21]Merivale to Commrs., 22 December 1855. C.O. 386/4. Reports 16, p. 43; 18, pp. 58-59 and appendix 52; 19, p. 57; 20, p. 55; 21, p. 42; 22, pp. 58-60 and appendix 48. The original royalty was $50 per 100 tons exported for the first two years and $100 per 100 tons for the next three years. After an alteration in the license in 1857, the royalty was reduced in 1859 to 2s. per ton (*i. e.*, the initial royalty was to be continued). In 1861 £2850 was owing as royalty and the license to Ord, Hindson and Hayes was cancelled. The agreement with Dixon and Co., 27 June 1861, called for the importation during the next three years of 20,000 tons of guano crusts at a royalty of 3s. per ton.

grounds at twelve months notice with compensation.[22] Her Majesty's government believed that in granting these licenses "the object to be kept in view was not to make a revenue out of Guano but to stimulate the discovery and secure the working of Guano Islands by British subjects without cost to the Government and with advantage to British commerce."[23] International complications indeed threatened at one time when the United States claimed possession of certain islands which had been leased by Great Britain to British subjects.[24]

In 1877 when the Emigration Board was winding up its financial duties it was arranged that the Crown Agents would thenceforth receive the rents and royalties paid under leases or licenses for guano islands, thus relieving the Commissioners of that work.[25]

In addition to the guano licenses the Commissioners acted for the Crown in negotiating and signing leases for the coal mines of Labuan. On the 31st of January 1848 they concluded an agreement with a Mr. Wise for the lease of the mines for a period of thirty years, the lessee agreeing to supply any coal

[22]Walcott to Elliot, 16 October 1862. C.O. 386/74, pp. 449-456. In one case, that of Messrs. Burt, Coombs and Daldy, a rental of £100 per annum, payable half yearly, was arranged by the Commissioners in substitution for the royalty. Murdoch to Rogers, 22 June 1863. C.O. 386/75, pp. 19-25. The island concerned in this lease, Hero (Coral Queen) Island in the South Pacific, subsequently became the centre of a long dispute. It was claimed that Hero was the same as Starbuck Island, and eventually this was found to be the case. *Ibid.*, pp. 52-56.

[23]Murdoch to Rogers, 27 May 1863, quoting statement of Duke of Newcastle. C.O. 386/75, p. 18.

[24]The islands concerned were Sombrero, Caroline, Malden, Starbuck, Flint, Christmas, Bauman, and Tiernhoven. The United States withdrew claim to Sombrero, and, the Commissioners declared, could have no claim to Caroline, which the British had occupied. Murdoch recommended referring to the Foreign Office the question on what grounds the American government could claim the other islands. Murdoch to Rogers, 28 November 1868. C.O. 386/86, pp. 91-94.

[25]See letters of Walcott to Crown Agents, 28 February 1877. C.O. 386/4. There were at that time licenses out for Sombrero, Flint, Caroline, Vestok and other islands.

required for the use of the Royal Navy at a price not over eleven shillings per ton, free of royalty; upon all other coal a royalty of two shillings six pence per ton was payable. Shortly afterwards Wise transferred his interests to the Eastern Archipelago Company.[26] Although prospects at first were good, the enterprise was not successful; a great sum of money was spent on the mines, most of the capital was lost, and by 1857 the Company was in course of liquidation.[27] Three years later another company, in which Sir James D. Elphinstone was prominent, came into the field, and Murdoch and Rogers in concert with the promoters of this Labuan Coal Company prepared the draft of an agreement which was signed July 31, 1860.[28] The new Company was hardly more successful than its predecessor; a new agreement was signed in 1862 (16 August) and a third one in 1864 (30 April). Finally after further negotiations the Oriental Coal Company took over the property of the Labuan Company.[29] Misfortune dogged the fourth enterprise too, and it had persistent difficulty in paying its rents.[30]

With the Falkland Islands the Commissioners had relations of a somewhat similar nature. Shortly after the Islands had

[26]Report 9, pp. 42-44.

[27]Report 18, pp. 58-59.

[28]There were delays in the Colonial Office in approving the lease. The document, though signed 31 July, actually bore date 12 June 1860. The Company was to have a capital of at least £75,000. See correspondence in C.O. 386/7. Report 21, p. 40.

[29]On 19 April 1862 Murdoch had an interview with Elphinstone, and secured Newcastle's agreement to an extension of twelve months for fulfillment of the conditions of the lease. New indentures were signed then and in 1864. C.O. 386/7. Reports 23, pp. 57-58; 24, pp. 51-52. Up to the end of 1865 no rent had apparently been paid. The Oriental Company took over in 1866; a new lease was signed 11 March 1868, and a third 7 May 1875. C.O. 386/7. Reports 26, p. 50; 29, pp. 44-45; 33, p. 47.

[30]In 1873 rent was suspended until June 1874; the rent due in August 1875 was not paid until January 1876.—In 1846 the Commissioners, upon instructions from Earl Grey, executed a lease with Messrs. Enderby for the Auckland Islands for thirty years as a whale fishery. Report 7, appendix 16.

been converted into a Crown Colony, a Mr. Lafone became interested in them, entered into long negotiations with the Commissioners, and finally signed an agreement under which he was to receive special terms in the purchase of a large area of land and in return was to import large numbers of cattle. After a time he encountered difficulties and the terms were somewhat relaxed. A few years later the Falkland Islands Company was formed to take over Lafone's property and enterprise; it received from the Commissioners a contract (21 April 1852) for the conveyance of mails between Monte Video and the colony. But the Company too encountered difficulties; in 1857 it entered proceedings against Lafone on alleged misrepresentation of the value of the property; the following year it was unable to pay the instalments due and the government decided to terminate the lease (6 July 1858). When it was pleaded that large sums of money had been expended on the colony and that it was hardly just that all this should be lost, the Commissioners were authorized to execute a fresh agreement reducing the amount of the remaining instalments and making other concessions (25 March 1859).[31] From then until 1878 the Company seems to have prospered. When the Emigration Commission was abolished the relations between it and the Company were transferred to the Crown Agents. The Company wrote expressing its best thanks for the very kind manner in which Walcott had invariably acted.[32]

At the close of 1857 the British government gave notice to the Hudson's Bay Company of its intention to terminate the

[31]Reports 6, appendix 25; 10, pp. 54-55; 12, pp. 65-66; 18, pp. 58-59; 19, pp. 56-57, appendices 47 and 48. C.O. 386/5. The following letter from Secretary Walcott to A. R. Lafone, 28 March 1846, is of interest. "I am assured that it can only have been under a misconception that you left for me the communication you placed on my table today, but I hasten to explain to you that it is quite impossible to receive any mark of gratification for the services which it is my duty to the public to perform . . . "; so he returned the £20 which had been enclosed. C.O. 386/39, pp. 327-328.

[32]C.O. 386/5.

grant of 13 January 1849 and resume Vancouver Island. The Company was asked to submit a statement of its claims against the Crown in accordance with the terms of the grant, and the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners were then set to work to check and verify the accounts submitted. The negotiations were both protracted and complicated, but gradually point after point was settled and the accounts were whittled down from £225,699. 9.11 to £40,289.19. 2. A partial settlement was then executed by the Commissioners. More negotiations followed and finally on 3 April 1867 Commissioners Murdoch and Walcott on behalf of the Crown signed a deed reconveying Vancouver Island to the Crown; £57,500 had been paid in settlement.[33]

Meanwhile British Columbia had "been added to the list of the colonial dependencies of the Crown." Gold discoveries had been reported there as early as June of 1856, but not until May 1858 was there any extensive immigration; then a rush from San Francisco began. "As soon as intelligence of this immigration was received a bill was introduced into Parliament for erecting British Columbia into a colony . . . "[34] Early in January 1859 the Emigration Commissioners submitted their recommendations for a land system in the new colony and Vancouver Island.[35] From that time on the proclamations, reports and official papers of the governor, concerning land and kindred subjects, were regularly referred by the Colonial Office to the Commissioners for digest, explanation, comments, and recommendations. In their annual Reports these officials manifested a keen interest in the progress of the infant colony.

[33]Negotiations had begun in April 1858! C.O. 386/84, pp. 55-60, 99-102, 187-194. C.O. 386/85, pp. 14-16, 134-143, 219-225, 225-226, 230-236, 251-253, 349-358, 417-427. C.O. 386/86, pp. 9-10, 10-19. Reports 22, pp. 39-42, appendix 43; 28, pp. 27-30.

[34]Report 19, p. 40. The bill received Royal Assent on August 2.

[35]Murdoch to Merivale, 5 January, 18 April and 29 June 1859. C.O. 386/84, pp. 111-121, 151-157, 181-184. He advised against the reservation to the Crown of coal and timber in the colony; such a practice was "useless for good, but not powerless for harm."

The Emigration Commissioners played a part in the establishment of the colony of British Columbia; they also played a leading rôle in the attempt to establish a colony in quite another part of the world. At the time the Board was created there were proposals in the air to erect a colony at Port Essington in the extreme north centre of the Australian continent. The Commissioners, after considering the proposals, prepared and submitted a long report. Vernon Smith, holding that knowledge upon the subject was still insufficient, was cold to the proposition, while Russell did not feel ready to spend on the colony the £25,000 which the Commissioners believed would be necessary.[36] As a result nothing was done that year.

> For the first time, we believe, [the Commissioners wrote] during the present generation, the question of forming an entirely new tropical colony, under the auspices of the Home Government, has been under serious consideration. . . . We regret that the state of the British revenue did not seem to justify the advance of money, which it was our duty to point out as requisite for the immediate formation of any considerable colony there. The accounts since received from the settlement have continued favourable; and we are still not without hopes of an opportunity to recur to the project of a colony in this position, at some future period, with better prospects of its realization.[37]

But time only served to bring out more clearly the disadvantages of the settlement. Its climate proved unsuited to European laborers, and it was too much out of the track of ships going to China or India to attract any extensive trade. The Commissioners asked the opinion of a Mr. Crawford who had had experience in the administration of affairs at Singapore; his reply offered no encouragement to the plans.[38] The small group of settlers who had been attracted there was not successful, and the locality was not suitable for a convict

[36]Elliot and Villiers to Stephen, 18 April 1840. C.O. 384/58. The third Commissioner, Colonel Torrens, did not sign the report but sent a separate letter and long memorandum on the subject. Torrens to Russell, 20 April 1840. *Ibid.* This separate report gave rise to trouble; *vide supra* pp. 63-64.

[37]Report 1840, p. 2.

[38]Report 1843, pp. 8-9, and appendix 6.

settlement. Yet the Commissioners did not believe it should be abandoned: "there is the possibility that if abandoned, the apparent convenience of the Harbor might attract Foreign Powers." The port might be required also as a coaling station for steamers plying between Sydney and Singapore. So in order to retain possession of Port Essington a small garrison was maintained there.[39] After 1847 the Commissioners did not again refer to the subject, and two years later the garrison was removed.

On at least two occasions members of the Emigration Commission were employed on diplomatic missions. One instance, Rogers' mission to Paris upon the coolie convention with France, has been referred to above. The other case was in the spring of 1870 when Commissioner Murdoch was sent abroad on the public service to Canada in connection with the apprehended difficulties in the Red River settlement, and to the United States to discuss the proposed convention for the regulation of emigration.[40] In both countries he inquired into problems relating to emigration, and on his return submitted a report upon so much of his mission as concerned that subject. In Canada little attention had been given to immigration for

[39]Reports 1844, p. 4; 5, p. 7; 7, p. 18. Commrs. to Stephen, 22 January 1847. C.O. 386/64, pp. 59-65. The little settlement at Port Essington was under the administration of Governor Gipps, 2000 miles away in Sydney! The Colonial Secretary adopted his recommendation that the garrison be frequently relieved.

In 1845 Her Majesty's government, "chiefly for the purpose of affording an outlet to the superabundant population of Van Dieman's Land," thought it advisable to establish "upon the most frugal footing possible a new colony to the northward of Moreton Bay settlement, to be called North Australia." The Commissioners were given the task of recommending terms for land alienation, but almost immediately the intention of establishing the new convict colony was abandoned. It might be noted, however, that the terms suggested by the Commissioners had been approved. Reports 6, pp. 11-12; 7, p. 12.

[40]Murdoch seems to have been absent from 26 March to after 24 May 1870. All Emigration Board letters between those dates were signed by Walcott. In a letter Murdoch refers to Roger's communication of 22 March which seems to have contained his instructions.

some years prior to 1869; the immigration department was in the hands of French-Canadians. Many people came to Canada but few remained; the majority followed "the highway to the Western States, imposing on the Dominion a heavy expense from which it derived no advantage." Murdoch censured the "injudicious system" of Buchanan in giving free passes on railroads for places in the United States. A new system, however, had been adopted by the Dominion in 1869, agents were appointed in the United Kingdom and upon the continent, and, as a result, more immigrants had remained in Canada. The "satisfactory nature" of the new arrangements was commended. Opinion in Canada held that free land grants were not suitable for new arrivals, and no confidence could be placed in getting repayments from assisted emigrants. Emigration had best be allowed to flow unpromoted.

From Canada Murdoch had gone to New York, and in his report he paid tribute to the very favorable arrangements in operation there. In Washington most of his time seems to have been spent in discussions upon the proposed convention, which was gone through section by section. "Mr. Fish and Mr. Bancroft Davis showed a decided willingness to assimilate the convention as far as possible to our Acts upon all points on which they considered they could carry Congress with them. Under these circumstances I see no reason to doubt that a satisfactory arrangement may eventually be arrived at."[41]

After receipt of the report Sir Frederic Rogers wrote to Murdoch informing him that the Colonial Secretary had forwarded a copy of the "clear and valuable report" to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The Under-Secretary added:

> Lord Granville desires me to express his sense of the good service you have been able to give from your great knowledge, experience and judgment, and he takes the present opportunity of acknowledging the advantage which Her Majesty's Government

[41] Murdoch to Rogers, 15 June 1870. C.O. 386/86, pp. 159-172. Hamilton Fish and Bancroft Davis were the Secretary and Assistant-Secretary of State.

have derived from your report on the progress of affairs at Ottawa, the tact and ability with which you have executed a mission of much delicacy, and the assistance which you have been enabled to afford to Sir John Young in the settlement of the Red River difficulties.[42]

The Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners certainly were not lacking variety in the duties which they performed.

[42]Rogers to Murdoch, 6 July 1870. C.O. 384/112. Murdoch was allowed £150 for expenses; he spent £137. 7. 8. Murdoch to Rogers, 10 June 1870. C.O. 386/119, p. 58. He subsequently received a grant of £250 "for his services in proceeding to Canada in connection with the Red River troubles." (26 July 1870.) *Ibid.*, p. 70.

XI

CONTEMPORARY CRITICISM OF THE COMMISSION

ALTHOUGH the establishment of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission was the government's answer to the agitation of the Colonial Reformers, their leader, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, was not very well pleased with the result of his propaganda.

The theorists of 1830 [he wrote] were far from being satisfied [with their early efforts]. In order to promote attention to the subject, they obtained, in 1836, an inquiry by a Select Committee of the House of Commons into their theory of colonization apart from government. The Report of this Committee on Colonial Lands and Emigration (whose labours were most ably conducted by Mr. Henry George Ward), had a considerable effect in spreading a knowledge of the subject. It also led Lord John Russell, in pursuance of one of its recommendations, to appoint a Commission of Colonial Land and Emigration; which, though a mockery of what a commission bearing that title ought to be, has been of service, through the recognition by the Crown of the principle, that the disposal of waste land in the colonies, and the superintendence of emigration, are functions of government which it requires a special authority to perform. I shall take an opportunity of explaining somewhere why this Commission has not realized the intentions with which we must presume that it was created.[1]

Wakefield later gave part of the promised explanation:

Theoretically, indeed, it is the especial function of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners to be masters of the subject which their title expresses;[2] but practically they have very different functions. Of these, one which the Colonial Office frequently imposes on them, is that of picking holes in a suggestion about colonization, which the Office dislikes *per se,* or dislikes being

[1]Wakefield, *Art of Colonization* (Collier edition), pp. 50-51.

[2]The "Statesman" had written that Mr. Mothercountry intended "to set the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners the task of objecting to the latter part of your scheme [of a sufficient price]; and as they ought to be masters of a subject which it is their especial function to understand thoroughly, I wish to keep my own opinion on it unsettled till after seeing what they may have to say." *Ibid.,* pp. 396-397.

troubled with. By much practice they have become skilful in this sort of official business, and really do it very well. You may expect, therefore, some cleverish special-pleading against "saddling colonies with debt," "taxing the feeble resources of young societies," and "giving an unhealthy stimulus to emigration." As these gentlemen always have an eye to their chief's predilections and antipathies, they may also throw in an argument for "spontaneous" emigration, of which Lord Grey has been very fond ever since certain elaborate and impracticable schemes of his own for promoting what he now calls "forced" emigration, all broke down. But they will not, partly because they dare not, examine the question candidly with a view of throwing light upon it. They dare not, because, in the first place, though their office is in Park-street, they are, from the very nature of the commission, mere clerks of colonial Downing-street; and secondly, because, whilst the "good hater," whose helpless subordinates these Commissioners are at present, hates nothing more than a suggestion of mine, his irascible and vindictive temper makes those who are at his mercy, and who know him, tremble at the thought of his displeasure.[3]

In the columns of the *Colonial Gazette,* a weekly of pronounced Wakefieldian views,[4] the Colonial Reformers were able to give further expression to their sentiments upon this latest creation of the government. At first, before all the details were known, the *Gazette* was quite favorably disposed;[5] but its tone was soon altered and severe criticisms appeared. Villiers was known only as the brother of a cabinet minister,[6] so the Commission really consisted of but Torrens and Elliot.

[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 397-398. The "Colonist" (Wakefield) is writing.

[4] "Completely unofficial, and published at the office of the Spectator, then an organ of advanced Radicalism." Wrong, *Buller,* p. 41.

[5] That a Commission was to be established was generally known by the beginning of January 1840; the government journals were instructed to explain that the principles laid down in the report of Ward's committee of 1836 were to be carried out. The *Colonial Gazette* quite approved (January 1, 1840; p. 3). The *Morning Chronicle* remarked: "The public will hail these announcements [of the establishment of the Commission] as the beginning of a new era in Colonial administration, from which the most beneficial results may be expected." (Quoted in *Col. Gazette,* 15 January 1840; p. 44.) The official *Gazette* of January 14 carried the notice of the Board's appointment.

[6] Villiers' brother, the fourth Earl of Clarendon, was Lord Privy Seal in Melbourne's cabinet.

The latter was branded as "a mere creature of the [Colonial] office" with a "general and marked unfitness for the business of colonizing"; nor was Torrens spared his share of sharp criticism. It was strongly hinted several times that "one of the objects of the Colonial Office in breaking up the special and trusted South Australian Commission, was to provide for this Mr. Elliot"; for Governor Gipps of New South Wales, in his dispatch to Glenelg, 27 February 1839, had pointed out the lack of funds in the colony for promoting immigration, and the exhaustion of these colonial funds, the *Gazette* affirmed, would have thrown Elliot out of a job. Nevertheless the editors for a time thought "it may be reasonably hoped that good will grow out of the appointment." Then Russell's instructions were published, and after a scrutiny of them the *Gazette* was convinced that the Commissioners were "crippled by the Instructions." The Board was "a worse than good-for-nothing trick of the Colonial Office."[7]

When the Emigration Board presented its first report the document was dissected by the *Gazette's* editors who came to the conclusion that the Commissioners had not done much as yet.

> It is not to be predicated of the Commission, on the mere showing of this their first report, that they are no more than clerks of reference for the Colonial Office, or that they lack the zeal or ability to discharge their new functions; but the next report must be a much more satisfactory statement of what they have done and are to do, or the question will recur, "what is the use of the Colonial Land and Emigration Board?"[8]

The next report did not appear until 1842; then the *Gazette* had another opportunity. " . . . The existence of some

[7] *Colonial Gazette,* 29 January, 12 and 19 February, 11 and 18 March; pp. 65-66, 106-109, 122-124, 171, 187. The *Gazette,* as has been seen, was strongly pro South Australia. Some of the dismissed S. A. Commissioners felt aggrieved at their summary dismissal and protested against the "unjustifiable proceedings of the Secretary of State." Two of them, Montefiore and Palmer, refused to sign the Commission's report for 1839 drawn up by Torrens. *Ibid.,* 15 and 29 July 1840.

[8] *Ibid.,* 25 November 1840; p. 785.

authority to regulate such an amount of emigration was a necessity, and the . . . Commissioners supplied the want. Their General Report for the year affords some test of their utility." But that report, the editors charged, was much too general in statement. They then drew attention to the distinction in title between the South Australian *Colonization* Commissioners and the Colonial Land and *Emigration* Commissioners. "The inference from the distinction of titles is that the Commissioners are concerned only in the sale of lands and the control of emigrants to settlements already formed, and not in the formation of new colonies."

> England possesses the several elements of colonization [*i. e.*, land, population, capital, enterprise] in a higher degree than any country in the world. . . . Yet this powerful and elaborately-managed country is to leave the process of colonization to chance; only troubling its public officers to look after the peddling details of emigration and land-sales. . . . The huge burden of pauperism under which this country consents to remain is a merely gratuitous endurance, so long as our resources of colonization are unexhausted.[9]

To this the Commission should turn its attention.

Dissatisfied though Wakefield and the *Gazette* were that the Commission was to be a board of emigration and not of colonization, one of the Reformers was of a somewhat different mind. Charles Buller, in his Appendix to the "Durham Report," had advocated an organization for the control of lands and emigration much stronger than the one subsequently established; yet in his famous address on systematic colonization in 1843 he referred to the great step taken by Lord Russell "when he organized the machinery of public emigration, by constituting the Land and Emigration Commissioners, and prescribed the nature of their duties in instructions which contain an admirable view of the general duties of a government with respect to colonization."[10]

[9] *Ibid.*, 28 September 1842; p. 610. After 1842 the *Gazette* paid little further attention to the Board.

[10] Buller, *Systematic Colonization*, p. 41. See also *infra*.

Parliament had its first say on the new government bureau during the course of a long debate in the Commons on June 2, 1840. Mr. Wm. S. O'Brien proposed three resolutions advocating a "well regulated system of colonization." Conditions in England, Scotland and Ireland, he said, all called for such a procedure, while in the colonies there was a demand for labor.[11] After sketching the policy of the government, O'Brien recommended that a free passage be granted to every man of good character. His remarks upon the new Board were confined to the comment:

> The South Australian Commission, consisting of an unpaid body of independent gentlemen, by whom that colony was founded, have been displaced, and their functions have been transferred to a Board of Land and Emigration, consisting of three paid Government commissioners. With this proceeding I am not disposed to find fault. . . .

But Mr. Ward, chairman of the Waste Lands Committee of 1836, was decidedly so disposed. In the first place the three Commissioners had been appointed by Russell and received their authority from him and not from parliament. "The noble Lord must be aware that whatever plan he adopted might be altered by his successor . . . It might not unfairly be urged, too, by the noble Lord's opponents, that his own want of confidence in his proposal was unquestionably exhibited by his refraining from obtaining for it a Parliamentary sanction." Further, he charged that the duties of the Commission were confined to superintending emigration to South Australia. Several colonies were excluded from the scope of the commission, and although there was every hope that Canada would soon come under its cognizance, South Africa and the West Indies certainly ought to be added. After such an attack Lord John Russell could scarcely remain silent.

[11]His first resolution read: "That in Great Britain and Ireland, the working classes are frequently exposed to extreme privation, from inability to procure employment."—It might be observed here that this chapter does not attempt to discuss the polemics of systematic colonization, except in so far as the Emigration Commission was involved.

The hon. Member for Sheffield [Ward] complained about the instructions to the land commissioners. There were many of the subjects which they were to investigate which had been long matters of discussion, and I thought it better that the Commissioners should attend minutely to those subjects and receive communications from those acquainted with the colonies, and who had most information on the subjects, before I should introduce any resolutions, or bring in a bill to Parliament upon the subject. I thought it better to adopt that less ambitious project, and to receive the report of gentlemen, such as those on the commission, who have been admitted to be gentlemen of intelligence and respectability, and who should apply their minds earnestly to the subject. I thought that better than bringing forward my theory, which I might borrow from others, or which I might have originated myself, as I should thus be afforded a greater possibility of bringing before the House a more perfect system than I otherwise could have done. I do not therefore despair, that the commission may prove of great value and importance with respect to emigration, as well as regards the North American as the other colonies; and I do not despair of establishing such a system as shall be satisfactory to this country, and to those who wish to emigrate.[12]

Three years later, after Russell had laid down and Stanley had taken up the seals of the Colonial Department, the House of Commons witnessed what was probably the greatest debate in its history upon the subject of emigration and colonization. Charles Buller in a long address on systematic colonization explained in detail the doctrines of the Reformers of 1830, urged that the policy begun by the regulations of 1832 and carried on by the Commission of 1840 be perfected in detail, and concluded by moving:

That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she will take into her most gracious consideration the means by which extensive and systematic colonization may be most effectually rendered available for augmenting the resources of Her Majesty's empire, giving additional employment to capital and labour, both in the United Kingdom and in the colonies, and thereby bettering the condition of her people.[13]

[12] *Hansard*, LIV, 832-894. O'Brien in his speech paid tribute to Wakefield. Mr. Hutt seconded the resolutions; others also spoke in support. Russell led the opposition, condemning the resolutions as too general. O'Brien did not press his motion to a division, but it was negatived.

[13] Buller's speech was also printed as a pamphlet; it was in this address

Lord Stanley, Viscount Howick, Lord John Russell and Mr. Hume, all authorities upon colonial policy, participated in the debate which then followed. The Colonial Secretary spoke at some length in defence of the Emigration Commission which, he said, was composed of

two gentlemen whose diligence and assiduity in the discharge of the duties of their office, are well known to all who come in contact with them. One of these gentlemen had long experience in the Colonial Office [Elliot], and, subsequently, as Secretary to the Government in Canada; the other [Villiers] is the brother of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton; and I am fully warranted in saying, that nothing can exceed the diligence and assiduity with which both these gentlemen discharge their duties.

They supplied very detailed information upon all points, gave every possible assistance, and supervised the work of the emigation agents. "Thus the superintending care of the Government is carried on, from point to point, from the time the emigrant leaves his home at the extremity of Norfolk or Connaught, till he rejoins his friends in the wilds and wastes of Upper Canada. From first to last, he is never for a single moment wholly withdrawn from the superintendence and protection of the Government." The House did not divide upon the subject as Buller withdrew his motion.[14]

that he paid tribute to Howick and Russell. "But it is necessary to a due understanding of the history of the question that I should acknowledge how much we owe to others, who had the opportunity, when in office, of giving executive effect to improved principles. Among these, the first place is due to my noble friend, the member for Sunderland [Lord Howick], who, in February 1832, when he had been about a year in office, took the first great step that the government has taken in the right direction, by promulgating the regulations whereby the sale of land was substituted for the old irregular habit of gratuitous grants, and the application of the proceeds to the conveyance of selected emigrants was commenced. My noble friend the member for London [Lord John Russell] made the next great step when he organized the machinery of public emigration, by constituting the Land and Emigration Commissioners, and prescribed the nature of their duties in instructions which contain an admirable view of the general duties of a government with respect to colonization."

[14] *Hansard,* LXVIII. 484-599. April 6, 1843. S. Crawford, who spoke immediately after Buller, charged that the United Kingdom was not fully

Success seemed nearer for Buller when, in June 1846, he was made Judge-Advocate General in Russell's first ministry. According to Wakefield, Buller had understood that he, Earl Grey, and Hawes should work together in the new government for colonial reform, especially for the development of controlled emigration, but Grey altered his views and overthrew the arrangement. . . . But whatever the cause little was done, and to some extent Buller found himself muzzled by office.[15]

The government was given a chance to do something early in the year 1847 when there was another extended debate on the subject of emigration. Vernon Smith, one time Parliamentary Under-Secretary for the Colonies, opened the debate; compulsory emigration, he said, was out of the question, and nationally assisted emigration was practically so; but there was a growing sentiment in favor of voluntary emigration, especially considering conditions in England, Scotland and Ireland. But government, it was said, had no money to spend on a scheme of emigration. A reference to the system then in practice under the Emigration Board caused him to pause.

He was not sure that he ought not to explain to the Members of that House, and certainly to the people of this country, that there was in this city a board to assist emigration from this country; and that three gentlemen, now alive, were engaged in the task, however little their existence might be known to the country at large. He had not the slightest intention of saying one word against the gentlemen who performed the duties of Colonial Commissioners; but they were so limited in the small duties allotted to them, that their superintendence was of very little use.

under cultivation and moved a counter resolution: "That the resources derivable from the lands, manufactures, and commerce of the United Kingdom, if fully brought into action, are adequate to afford the means of giving employment and supplying food to the whole population; and that, therefore, before any measures be adopted for removing to foreign lands any portion of that population, it is the first duty of this House to take into consideration the measures necessary for the better application of these resources to the employment and support of the people." He later withdrew his motion.—A few days later, 24 April, the Emigration Board was for a moment under fire from the Lord Mayor of London and from Vernon Smith. *Ibid.*, LXVIII. 873-878.

[15]Wrong, *Buller*, pp. 57-58.

The speaker quoted from Russell's instructions to the Board to show their powers and duties. The reports of 1845 and 1846, however, had said nothing concerning the diffusion of information; and although an act concerning waste lands and a passengers' bill had been passed, and the Commissioners had checked some unsound and improper schemes, nevertheless "he did not see any one instance in which they had suggested or been the advocates of plans for the promotion of a sound system of emigration." He would advocate a greater diffusion of information through agencies in the parishes. More emigration agents were needed; in 1843 Lord Stanley had spoken of an officer at *every* port in the United Kingdom: "Make this description literal." The Board, Smith alleged, did not have sufficient dignity and importance; it should not be a mere dependency of the Colonial Office. In conclusion he moved: "That, in order to assist and encourage voluntary emigration to the Colonies, it is expedient to increase the importance and authority of the Land and Emigration Board, to add to their agency in Great Britain and Ireland, and promote their vigilant superintendence of the passage and future location of the emigrants."[16]

Benjamin Hawes, who now occupied the post of Parliamentary Under-Secretary, led the defence of the Board. The hon. Member, he declared, had underestimated the Commissioners: the decrease of mortality from 5 per cent. to 0.5 per cent. per annum was one evidence of their work; they also had under their guidance the coolie emigration to the West Indies. The present system of emigration, he believed, was quite satisfactory, and "the present board had been successful and of great benefit." The ministers intended taking some further steps, and welcomed suggestions, but he was convinced that government was doing about all it could to encourage free emigration. Lord John Russell supported Hawes and "was not

[16]He detailed the changes and additions to be made, the whole extra cost to be £30,000.

of opinion that any large assistance on the part of the Government was desirable." The previous Under-Secretary, G. W. Hope, believed that the Commissioners had displayed the greatest skill and energy; Buller also spoke in defence of the Board as it was.[17] Smith replied to his opponents; "And the Previous Question being put, That that Question be now put:— It passed in the Negative."[18]

This decade, 1840 to 1850—particularly the years 1843 to 1849—, was a period of colonization mania. Plans, schemes, proposals filled the printing shops, flooded the Colonial Office, and washed over into parliament. One of the leading expositions of systematic colonization was a little book of that title written by Arthur Mills. Like all advocates of colonization he took a fling at the Emigration Commissioners calling them "an ancillary board to the Colonial Office."

> The chief function of these gentlemen, as respects emigration, is to compile from the latest reports, and publish annually, a little circular containing information as to rates of wages, expense of travelling, cost of living, and demand for labour in the various colonies. . . . As regards North America, the field of emigration of four-fifths at least of those who yearly leave our shores, the compilation of this pamphlet, and the general supervision of the subordinate agents, are the only duties of the Board.[19] Ten agents,

[17]Buller did not, as Wrong says (*op. cit.*, pp. 57-58), advocate more extended powers for the Board. "Any deficiency in the organization of the Land and Emigration Board was not in reality the difficulty in the way of colonization . . . Now, he did not mean to say when the British colonies should be laid open, and should afford that field to the industry of this country which they ought to afford, that the office of Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioner might not be one of far greater importance and utility; but he did say that to commence with a reform of the . . . Board at the present moment, would be to fit it for functions which at present it had no opportunity of discharging." The colonies should be given self-government, and a sound land system established.

[18]*Hansard,* XC. 837-861. March 4, 1847. *Commons Journals,* CII. 197. Mackinnon seconded Smith's motion; W. S. O'Brien also spoke in favor, but was more anxious to discuss colonization.

[19]"A few emigrants have, I believe, been sent to South Australia under the superintendence of the Board. It should be added that a sort of inter-colonial emigration of Coolies to Mauritius and the West Indies has been organized by the Commissioners."

responsible to the Commissioners, are stationed at the principal ports of embarkation in the United Kingdom. There are also agents at the principal ports of those colonies to which emigration usually takes place.[20]

Mills then outlined his colonization proposals which were to be "intrusted, both as to number and qualifications, and the arrangement of all other details to the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners." "And here I may observe, that it would be at least one merit of my plan, that it would afford these gentlemen, who have already a sonorous title and good salaries, the additional advantage of full employment, which they do not now possess."[21]

The distress emigration of that year (1847) did afford the Board more than full employment; but it also gave a sharper point to the attacks of the "colonizers." Grey had to face a long criticism in the Lords when he laid some papers on the Table, and replied with a detailed explanation and defense of the government's policy. "In 1837, the extent of emigration had so far increased, that my noble Friend, Lord Glenelg, . . . appointed a separate office for the management of that business; and hence the origin of the Land and Emigration Commission . . . a measure of incalculable importance and benefit, both to this country and to the colonies." For the past few years the Commission had helped select and send settlers to Australia, but "the voyage [thither] is so much longer and so much more expensive than the voyage to America, that unless the colonies should pay a very large portion of the expense, the emigrants would in nearly all cases prefer going to America; either to our own colonies there, or to the United States." In the case of the great annual exodus of settlers from Ireland to Canada and the United States, a

[20]Mills, *Systematic Colonization,* pp. 22-23. Nine years later Mills wrote his famous *Colonial Constitutions.* In 1864 he defended the Commissioners in parliament (*vide infra*).

[21]*Ibid.,* p. 28. These statements, like so many of those in parliament, do not reflect a clear conception of the Commission's duties and actual work.

large portion of it was "provided for by means of funds remitted from America to their friends in this country and in Ireland, by those who had gone out before." One member of a family often emigrated and then sent money to convey the rest. Grey hoped that clubs of working men would be formed to send out one or two members who should assist others to go later.

Lord Monteagle at once attacked Grey's whole attitude to emigration: he was very much disappointed at what had been accomplished, and quoted from remarks of Grey in 1831, 1845 and other times to show, as he claimed, that the Secretary had not kept his promises. Government should no longer hesitate and dilly-dally, but at once put in operation a systematic colonization scheme! Grey rose again to answer the attack. "The State should only interfere to assist and direct the emigrant, leaving him to act for himself . . . I repeat that the proper functions of a Government in this matter are not to supersede the efforts of individuals, but rather to guide and assist individual exertion."[22] That always had been, that always was the answer of government after government to proposals for state-conducted colonization. It was for the very purpose expressed in the Colonial Secretary's words that the Colonial Land and Emigration Board existed.

But the days of systematic colonization were waning now; indeed the whole topic of emigration which had been so prominent for a generation was now beginning to pass into the background, and, so far as the colonies were concerned, political problems—responsible government, federation, etc.—occupied more and more the attention of government and parliament after 1850. The Colonial Reformers passed off the scene; the Manchester School and "Separatism" were supreme.[23] At the same time the attitude towards the Commissioners began to change; they reached the peak of their work and started down

[22]*Hansard,* CI. 1-50. August 10, 1848.

[23]See Bodelsen, *Studies in Mid-Victorian Imperialism.*

the other side; the demands for wider powers and increased utility were not so loud, more and more insistent became the urgings for contraction and restriction. In mid-1850 when parliament was considering the estimates for the next fiscal year, Hawes, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary, asked Commissioner Murdoch for a memo. of the Board's duties so that he could answer any objections which might be made. Murdoch listed their functions as (1) to consider and report on all questions referred to them by the Secretary of State; these related principally to claims for land, plans for colonization, plans for the sale of lands, plans for the promotion of emigration by public or private means, complaints re the treatment of emigrants, complaints re the passenger laws; (2) to superintend the working of the Passengers Act; (3) to take up ships for the conveyance of emigrants to Australia, and the Cape, and from India, Sierra Leone and St. Helena to the West Indies; to see to the fitting of such ships; (4) to select emigrants for Australia and the Cape and to appoint surgeons and religious instructors for the vessels; (5) to submit necessary alterations of the laws, etc.; (6) to conduct all pecuniary arrangements connected with emigration to Australia and the West Indies; (7) to furnish statistical and other information; and finally (8) the two legal members of the Board were required to report on all laws passed in the colonies and prepare cases for the Crown lawyers. As an indication of the amount of work performed the Commissioner pointed out that between 1840 and 1850 the Board had received an average of 30,890 letters per annum and dispatched 32,178; the correspondence, however, was now decreasing and with it the number of clerks was being reduced.[24] The emigration vote of £13,296 was agreed to, however, without debate.[25]

[24]Memo. by T.W.C.M. to B. Hawes; undated but evidently of July 1850. Further statistics of emigration and correspondence, likely to be of use in a debate, were also given by Murdoch. C.O. 386/116, pp. 208-212.

[25]*Hansard*, CXIII. 69. July 19, 1850. Except for a question raised in 1843, debates on the emigration vote did not begin until 1851. The first vote mentioned in *Hansard* is that of 1850, the others are recorded in the *Journals*.

In 1851 there was a short debate. Mr. F. Scott objected to the sum proposed, £25,331. The number of emigrants to foreign lands was now increasing, and although the Commission, originally of but one member, had been increased to four (*sic*), he wished a committee to inquire into the Board next year with the view of making it more efficient. Mr. Hawes in defending the Board claimed that the hon. Member's information was erroneous.

> The only funds at the disposal of the Commissioners were derived from the land sales in the colonies. They expended in emigration the whole amount supplied for that purpose from the colony, and, if that sum fell short, or increased from time to time, the Commissioners were not responsible for it. . . . The reason why the accounts of the Commissioners did not come under the notice of that House, was because the funds were not voted by that House, but by the colonies, where the accounts were very jealously scrutinised. The Commissioners had to administer the funds supplied from the colonies, and generally to superintend the working of the Passengers' Act.[26]

From that time on scarcely a year passed without some debate on the emigration vote.[27] In 1854 the first demands were made for the abolition of the Board. Mr. Bright thought the whole staff ought to be reduced; it spent £600 a year in postage alone! Mr. W. Williams was of the opinion that, since the public lands had now been generally surrendered to the colonial governments, such a charge as this (£16,840) ought not to be made against the revenue of the mother country. Another member, Captain Scobell, charged that it was unfair that emigration officers should get but £208, while clerks of the Board received £500. Sir George Grey, the Colonial Secretary, defended the vote, and was seconded by Mr. J. O'Connell who took a view directly opposite to Bright's, and claimed that the staff was insufficient; it should be made a government depart-

[26] *Ibid.*, CXVIII. 680-683. July 14, 1851.

[27] June 10, 1852—£14,083, some comments; May 20, 1853—£17,396, no debate recorded. *Ibid.*, CXXII. 392-394; CXXVII. 454.

ment.[28] On another occasion a member, Mr. Spooner, declared that government should check emigration. Grey briefly explained the government's policy: no *inducements* to emigrate were offered. At the same time he stated it was not improbable that a reduction in the number of the Commissioners would shortly take place.[29] The following year there was a new Colonial Secretary and Spooner tried again. He "trusted [the] Colonial Secretary would do all he could to diminish emigration." Many others followed him, favoring a reduction of the vote and Board. Mr. Labouchere, the new Secretary, defended the vote and again explained the government's policy—no stimulation to emigration, but direction and control only. He informed the House that the Commissioners "afforded most important assistance to the Colonial Office in revising the drafts of Colonial Bills." Sir John Pakington too "readily [bore] testimony to the admirable manner in which the present Emigration Commissioners performed their duties, and to the valuable assistance which they afforded to the Colonial Office, as stated by the right hon. Gentleman, in revising the drafts of Colonial Bills." As the debate ended the Colonial Secretary remarked that he anticipated a diminution of the Board in future.[30]

When the estimate came up in 1857 a new champion of

[28]June 26, 1854. *Ibid.,* CXXXIV. 720-721. Bright was one of the leaders of the Manchester School.

[29]May 7, 1855—£16,720. *Ibid.,* CXXXVIII. 208-210. Two years later the Commission was reduced by one (Wood).

[30]April 14, 1856—£14,582. *Ibid.,* CXLI. 1010-1013. Early in the debate Labouchere said that, "on the whole, he could not recommend any great or immediate reduction of the establishment"; but at the conclusion he informed the House that "he thought they had reason to anticipate for the future a diminution of the business of the Commissioners, and the Government would, of course, feel bound at the same time to diminish, as far as possible, the expenditure incurred under that head." He declared "it had never been the policy of this country to stimulate emigration, but to direct and control it." A Mr. Hutchins said that when the Board was established it did a great deal of good, but circumstances had altered and labor was now scarce. Pakington, it might be noted, was a former Colonial Secretary.

reduction took the floor, C. B. Adderley. The gradual reduction of the emigration vote, he said, "proved the uselessness of this Board."

> When this vote commenced, the Colonies took no part in the promotion of emigration; now, however, they took a very active one. At one time it was a great object with the Imperial Legislature to induce the poor to emigrate, because there was supposed to be a surplus population. The reverse was the case now. . . . The colonies should bear the expense. That they thought so themselves was evident, for they actually voted sums which were sent over to this country to be disposed of by the Board. . . . The Colonies were much dissatisfied with the management of these funds, so much so that they had established an agency of their own, though it was subsidiary to the Board.

Mr. Labouchere replied that two years ago at his recommendation the Board had been reduced to the extent of one Commissioner; but it still had important duties to perform and "it would, for the present at least, be quite impossible to dispense with their services."[31] Two years later Adderley returned to the attack upon the same grounds. The number of Commissioners should be reduced. The colonies complained of the manner in which the business of the Emigration Board was conducted, and were establishing offices of their own in England. The number of emigrants now sent out by the Commissioners was very small. After all, the matter was one for the colonies more than for the mother country, for they were the parties interested in the emigration of persons from the United Kingdom. Adderley had no objection to that part of the vote which was for the payment of the officers at the ports, who discharged very important functions under the Passengers Act; but to that part which provided for the expenses of the Emigration Board he did object, and early next session he would move a reduction of the staff by one Commissioner

[31] July 3, 1857—£13,424. *Ibid.*, CXLVI. 909-912. It was two *months* ago and not two *years* ago that Labouchere's reduction took place—a stenographic error? Adderley (Lord Norton) was not a Separatist, but was an ardent champion of colonial self-government. (See Bodelsen.)—July 12, 1858—£12,828; no debate. *Hansard*, CLI. 1270.

and one secretary. Sir Harry Verney also spoke; he was one who did not think emigration necessary. Instead of sending our people away, we ought to endeavor to keep them at home; we had not too many, we wanted more.[32]

Opposition to the vote was now becoming a regular matter. In the following year the Under-Secretary, Charles Fortescue, was called upon to explain, in answer to Williams' query about the staff of the Board, that there had been two Commissioners, but one had been transferred to the Colonial Office, and his place had not been filled up. A secretary had undertaken the duties, with a small addition of £200 to his salary, so that there was in reality a saving of £800 a year. A member then referred to the increasing scarcity of agricultural labor in Great Britain and to the accumulation of convicts. Why not send the convicts to the colonies? A second member suggested sending out females from the workhouses. To this it was objected that the females sent out to South Australia in 1857 had not been satisfactory; the colonies would no longer take convicts. This prompted a member to suggest Vancouver's Island as suitable for convicts. Mr. Fortescue replied that the colonies supplied the funds for assisted emigration and did not want workhouse females or convicts. Why did not the colonies then bear the whole expense, it was immediately asked. He replied that if the restrictions of the Emigration Board were removed, the colonists would probably bear the whole expense. Mr. Cave rose to the Under-Secretary's aid: he felt bound to bear testimony to the zeal and efficiency of the Commissioners and to the good they had effected in placing emigration on the best footing, as well as in dispelling many false impressions.[33]

After the interval of a year parliament again became inquisitive. Mr. Childers interrogated the Under-Secretary about a proposed transfer of the Emigration Board's duties to the

[32]July 28, 1859—£12,708. *Ibid.*, CLV. 529-530.

[33]August 16, 1860—£11,472. *Ibid.*, CLX. 1366-1367. In view of some of the opinions expressed above is it any wonder that the colonies were sometimes suspicious of imperial control of emigration?

Transport Board of the Admiralty. Fortescue pointed out in reply that the Colonial Secretary, Newcastle, had objected to the plan; the process of emigration was long and complicated, and "it would probably be highly disadvantageous to the conduct of emigration if all the steps of that process were not to remain in the same hands." Newcastle accordingly felt "that to sanction the proposed transfer of duties to the Transport Board would be to sacrifice a most useful system, now in excellent operation, to what was little more than a false attempt at uniformity; that the Colonial Agents would not feel equal confidence in the new administration, and that the change would therefore only tend to revive all the old evils of emigration."[34] Later in the session the emigration estimate came up as usual, and Adderley was again set to attack along his old line. The vote had not been reduced enough.[35] Why should not the Australian colonies—like others—support their own emigration agents? Mr. Smith seconded his complaints; while the Under-Secretary declared that he had never before heard dissatisfaction expressed (!). The duties of the Board were once more detailed to the House; it "had discharged its duties as satisfactorily as any other department in the state." Lord C. Paget again explained that due to objections of the Colonial Office the management of emigration had not been transferred to the Transport Board.[36]

In 1864 Adderly made his greatest, and last extended, attack on the emigration vote.

[34]February 28, 1862. *Ibid.*, CLXV. 854-855. Fortescue also pointed out that the Board looked after the migration from India and China to the West Indies and Mauritius, and advised the Colonial Office constantly upon questions of land and labor in the colonies.—In 1861 there had been no debate on the vote (£10,090). *Ibid.*, CLXIV. 1029.

[35]In truth this year it was slightly increased!

[36]June 12, 1862—£10,834. *Ibid.*, CLXVII. 514-516.—June 25, 1863—£6,720 to complete the sum for emigration. *Ibid.*, CLXXI. 1489. The index (CLXXII) gives the total emigration vote as £10,720; but the *Journals* give only the £6,720 (CXVIII. 322).

He wished to know what was done by that body, having its offices in an obscure back street, and with no public funds at its disposal beyond the salaries of its members. It appeared that some of the colonies had emigration agents of their own in this country, while other colonies had their emigration business conducted by that Board. He believed that but for that business the Board would have very little work of any kind to perform.

He was seconded by another persistent opponent of the vote, W. Williams, who complained of the staff of six clerks as altogether too large; one had been added since the previous year. Arthur Mills defended the Board; he would "lament any diminution of the usefulness of the Emigration Board, which consisted of very efficient men." Fortescue then rose to give an extended explanation.

The Emigration Board was one of the most effective of our public departments, with important and onerous duties to perform. The Board, by the desire of the colonies in question, superintended the emigration to Victoria, W. Australia, and Port Natal. The Board chartered the ships, appointed the surgeons, and looked after the emigration depots. Another important branch of its duties was to superintend and work the Passengers Act. No doubt breaches of that Act occasionally occurred, but they would be still more numerous if the Board did not exist. The Emigration Board had also to superintend the great system of Coolie emigration from the East Indies and China to the West Indian colonies and the Mauritius. That necessitated frequent communication with the Colonial and Indian Offices. The Board chartered the ships and advised the Secretary of State for the Colonies on all matters relating to emigration, and also on questions affecting the management and disposal of the Crown lands in all colonies where they had not been made over to the local Government. It was also called upon to report upon every despatch from the West Indian Colonies, the Mauritius, and Natal, relative to emigration in all its branches. The Colonial Office was thus brought into constant communication with the Emigration Board, and derived the most valuable assistance from the long experience and ability of the Emigration Commissioners. The Board likewise embodied in its Colonization Circular advice relative to the wages, demand for labour, and means of reaching the colonies.

Adderley rose again; "he had attacked that Vote for many years. When he first began there were three Commissioners.

By perseverance he got the number reduced to two, and he believed that if they were further reduced to a single Commissioner he would be quite sufficient for all the duties of the Board." The Under-Secretary objected to this that "there was, in fact, only one Commissioner now. There were certain duties which were required by law to be performed by two Commissioners, and for the purpose of enabling that to be done the Secretary [Walcott] had received powers to perform those duties."

Attacks came from other directions. Captain Jervis charged that Irish emigrants were being enticed into the American army to be murdered. Mr. Fortescue replied to this that "it was not for the Emigration Commissioners, or any Department of the Government, to undertake the paternal duty of persuading emigrants to go to one country rather than another." In answer to a question how the Commissioners could regulate coolie emigration, he pointed out that, "of course, the emigration must in a great measure be regulated on the spot. But then it was absolutely necessary that the Government at home should superintend the whole process, which was conducted under the strictest rules for the protection of the emigrants. Those rules were framed by the Colonial Office, with the advice of the . . . Commissioners." Mr. Cave once again bore testimony to the efficiency of the Board. "Nothing could be more stringent than the rules laid down and enforced by the Board . . . The people of the West Indies, indeed, complained that the regulations were much too strict. He did not concur in this, and, as far as his experience went, no Department of the Government was more efficiently conducted than the Emigration Board." Mr. Cardwell also bore testimony to "the valuable, praiseworthy, and conscientious services of the Emigration Commissioners."[37]

[37]June 16, 1864—£7,720 to complete the sum for emigration. *Hansard*, CLXXV. 1891-1896. The index (CLXXVI) gives the total vote as £10,720 (the same as 1863), but the *Journals* (CXIX. 339) again record only the £7,720. During the debate Colonel Dunne asked about the duties of the

After this extended debate opposition to the vote decreased for a few years.[38] During the course of one brief discussion Cardwell, then Colonial Secretary, in reply to the old argument that the colonies should vote the money, very aptly pointed out that the sum appropriated by parliament was not to remove persons to the colonies, but to see that "those who emigrated did so in a manner consistent with humanity, safety, and comfort."[39] In 1869, however, the old attacks were renewed. Several months before the estimate vote came up, Mr. Hardcastle asked the number and names of the Commissioners, the number and salaries of the clerks and assistants, the expenses and to what purposes, the duties of the Board, and finally "whether Colonial Emigration is not now almost entirely managed by agents of the Colonies, acting independently of the Commissioners; and, whether the Government proposes to continue the Commission in its present form?" To all these queries the Under-Secretary, Monsell, gave reply. There were two Commissioners, an assistant secretary, seven clerks, and twenty-three emigration officers. The salaries of Commissioners and clerks totalled about £8000 of which £1300 was paid out of colonial funds. The salaries of emigration officers and assistants, £3912, brought the total to £11,595; the parliamentary vote supplied £9829, colonial funds the balance of £1766. Their duties at present were to carry out the Pas-

Board. Williams asked why there were six officers at Liverpool that year, as against five for the year before. Cardwell said that the explanation lay in the greatly increased emigration from that port. Several members referred to the "enticement" of Irish into the Union army. (*Vide supra.*) *Hansard* does not record that Adderley attacked the vote *before* the reduction from three to two Commissioners was made.

[38]June 8, 1865—£10,531, no debate; July 19, 1867—£8,036, no debate; July 3, 1868—£9,231, no debate. *Hansard,* CLXXIX. 1281; CLXXXVIII. 1770; CXCIII. 675. It might be pointed out in passing that from the middle of 1866 to the end of 1868 Adderley was Parliamentary Under-Secretary; the votes for 1867 and 1868 showed increases!

[39]May 10, 1866—£7,418. *Ibid.,* CLXXXIII. 728-731. One member (a Mr. Powell) said he thought the time was not far distant when no money would be voted; we had not a surplus of population at home.

sengers Act, select and dispatch bodies of emigrants to Western Australia and Victoria, superintend emigration from India and China and the return of the emigrants to Asia, and to decide all questions regarding colonial Crown lands, leases, or grants. In 1868 they received 20,000 letters, and up to date (April 12) 6306 that year. The emigration to Australia, except to Victoria and Western Australia, was now inconsiderable. Queensland and New Zealand had independent agents; so also had South Australia, but the superintendence of emigration to the latter was in the hands of the Commissioners. They were at present also sending out discharged artisans from the dockyards.

It was under the consideration of Government whether the Commission should be continued. There was no doubt, from what he had already stated, that the duties had very much decreased, but the difficulty with respect to the abolition of the office was that, on account of the large pensions that would have to be paid, there would be very little saving to the public, who would likewise lose the advantage of the services of the two excellent officers.[40]

Later in the session, when the estimates came up for vote, there was further discussion. Sir Charles Adderley, back in opposition again, said the emigration officers at the ports were most useful public servants, but he thought one of the two Commissioners might be taken into the new Colonial Office. Mr. Alderman Lusk agreed that the sum should be reduced; the occupation of the Board, owing to the arrangements of colonial governments, was now all but gone. Mr. Monsell again rose to reply:

Arrangements had been made under which the staff of the Emigration Office would be received into the new Colonial Office, and thus the expenses of superannuation would be saved. More meritorious public officers than the two gentlemen now at the head of the Emigration department could not be found in the public service, and the best thing that could be done was to utilize their services by taking them into the Colonial Office instead of superannuating them. The reduction which would be made if the

[40]April 12, 1869. *Ibid.*, CXCV. 579-580.

Emigration Board were abolished would be £2000 per annum, making allowance for the expenses of superannuation.[41]

Next year Adderley and Monsell repeated almost *verbatim* their little dialogue.[42]

The days of the Emigration Board were now distinctly numbered, and the annual estimate rapidly declined.[43] But even in its old age the Commission was not entirely forgotten, and one member of parliament made a futile attempt to give it new life and vigor. On February 20, 1872, Mr. Macfie made a very long motion for various returns giving the names of the Commissioners, their instructions and functions, data concerning emigration, land prices, publications, etc. The Commissioners' instructions, he feared, had now lapsed. Sir Harry Verney seconded the motion and others spoke in its favor. As Knatchbull-Hugessen, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary, was agreeable to some parts of the motion, Macfie consented to amend the form of his original motion, which was then withdrawn with the leave of the House, and a shorter one substituted and agreed to. The amended motion called for the same information as noted above, except the emigration statistics. During the course of the debate Knatchbull-Hugessen outlined the duties of the Board.

[41]July 29, 1869—£9500. *Ibid.,* CXCVIII. 961-962.

[42]July 29, 1870—£8545. *Ibid.,* CCIII. 1246-1247. In a book published in 1869 Adderley expressed views which hardly seem to be in harmony with his attitude in parliament. " . . . To encourage emigration effecutally, we must in the first place spread more information, and increase agency. The Emigration Commissioners should come out of their hiding-place in Park Street, and be part of the Colonial Ministry, nothing being more essentially a part of the work of that Department than the superintendence, advertisement, and agency of emigration. The information which is crowded into a closely-printed circular, issuing periodically for sale from those Commissioners might be distributed more widely and intelligently by advertising frequently the few facts that are wanted through the newspapers, and their agencies throughout the country might be multiplied, and made far more active than they are." *Review of "The Colonial Policy of Lord J. Russell's Administration," by Earl Grey, 1853; and of subsequent Colonial History,* pp. 409-410.

[43]August 14, 1871—£7345, no debate. *Hansard,* CCVIII. 1644.

It is quite true that when the Emigration Commissioners were first appointed, their principal duty was to superintend the location of emigrants in the waste lands of the colonies; but as time went on, this country deemed it right that all, or nearly all, our colonies should control their own waste lands, without any interference on our part. That being the case, the question of the duties of the Commissioners became much altered, and they now practically exist for these purposes—to afford to the Colonial Office every possible information respecting emigration, and to superintend the working of the Passengers' Act, and to see that good provisions and good water are provided, and every possible arrangement made for the convenience of persons leaving this country for another.[44]

The official statement, prepared in answer to the address of the House of Commons, was much more detailed. The functions of the Commissioners were stated as: (1) To consider and report on all colonial acts and ordinances and all questions relating to colonial lands referred to them by the Secretary of State and under his orders to prepare and execute on behalf of the Crown guano and other licences or leases and to receive the rents and royalties payable thereunder. (2) To deal with all matters relating to emigration. Under this head were included the administration of the Passengers Acts in the United Kingdom, the suggestion and preparation of amendments when necessary, the reporting on all colonial acts and ordinances relating to immigration, the superintendence of the emigration from India and elsewhere to the British labor-importing colonies and of the treatment of the immigrants in those colonies, and the consideration and reporting on all questions connected with emigration schemes whether for British emigrants or others such as the Polynesian inter-insular emigration. Formerly the Board had to collect and charter vessels for the dispatch of large bodies of emigrants to whom passages out of the colonial funds were granted. At the present time the

[44] *Ibid.*, CCIX. 773-786. *Commons Journals,* CXXVII. 55-56. Macfie, a Liberal, was a leader in the new popular interest in the colonies; he advocated the unity of the Empire and recommended emigration as the remedy for pauperism. (See Bodelsen, *passim.*)

Commissioners conducted only a small emigration of this nature, principally of female servants to New South Wales and the emigration of commuted pensioners from the Admiralty and War Office. The latter involved the advance of the amounts necessary for the pensioners' outfit and settlement of their debts, the engagement of their passages and the remittance of the balance of their commutation money to the places of their destination. (3) To furnish information to the public respecting emigration and the British colonies. For this purpose the Commissioners annually prepared a general Report to be laid before parliament, a Colonization Circular containing detailed information likely to be useful to persons wishing to settle in the colonies, and other publications and notices affecting emigration.[45]

Armed with this information Mr. Macfie began an unavailing agitation for reorganization and rejuvenation of the Commission. On the estimate vote that year (1872) he urged adding some members of parliament, colonists or friends of the working class to the Board, to carry out its original purpose of directing a flow of emigration and utilizing the tracts of land belonging to the Empire. But his was a lone voice in the wilderness.[46] Again the following year he made his plea.

Mr. Macfie regretted that there were greater facilities for emigrants to go to the United States than to our own colonies, and expressed his opinion that the Board ought to consider the matter with a view of retaining a larger proportion of the emigrants

[45]Return to an Address of Commons, 20 February 1872. C.O. 384/100.

[46]June 17, 1872—£7410; no others spoke. *Hansard,* CCXI. 1902. Rivington, writing about this time, expressed somewhat similar views: "It is true, we have the honour to possess two Royal Commissioners of Emigration, and a regularly constituted Board, with first and second-class clerks, &c., who issue an Annual Report, though it cannot be said that much life is shown in the arrangement. We seem to require trustworthy and representative officials in our Colonial Office, who shall be colonists, men of some position in the world, free from party politics, and with a certain power to guide and control all Emigration schemes that emanate from the brains of enthusiasts, philanthropists, and schemers." *In the Track of Our Emigrants,* p. xiii.

under the dominion of the British Crown. The Board was originally constituted to develop the lands of the British Empire. The right hon. Gentleman [Knatchbull-Hugessen] had said that if the colony of Western Australia asked for the control of their lands, it would be given to them in the same way as it had been given in reference to other colonies. This was to be regretted, because experience had shown that the effect of that policy was to prevent such lands from being available for the people of this country. In his opinion, this course should not be followed any further, especially as these lands in Western Australia were almost the only ones now remaining under the control of Parliament. In his opinion, the infusion of a little new blood in reference to the constitution of the Board would do good.[47]

But it was too late for transfusions now, and the few remaining votes for the Emigration Board passed without debate and without comment.[48]

[47]May 12, 1873—£4429. *Hansard,* CCXV. 1814. "Mr. Alderman Lusk asked why the staff of the Emigration Commissioners had not been reduced, though an important part of their duties had been transferred to the Board of Trade? Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen replied, that there had not yet been an opportunity for a full revision of the staff."

[48]June 1, 1874—£4460; August 4, 1875—£4176; June 9, 1876—£4017; July 18, 1877—£1742 (this was the last vote). *Ibid.,* CCXIX. 791; CCXXVI. 534; CCXXIX. 1660; CCXXXV. 1418.

CONCLUSION

MUCH further research remains to be done, particularly in the archives of the various colonies, before any final judgment can be passed on the Commissioners and their work. Nevertheless some opinions may be safely expressed upon the basis of the investigation already completed.

1. For a period of thirty-eight years the Colonial Land and Emigration Board was the bureau for the diffusion of information relating to emigration, and to the economic and social status of the Empire in general. By circulars, pamphlets, placards, and notices the Commissioners kept the emigrants supplied with knowledge likely to be of need or value to them in reaching and settling in their new homes overseas. So important was this work that another office was established to carry on after the Board had ended.

2. For a period of thirty-three years the Board exercised a general supervision over all emigration leaving the ports of the United Kingdom. Through its corps of Emigration Officers, and through the series of Passengers Acts which it enforced and, whenever necessary, drafted for revision and amendment, the Board was able to regulate conditions on board British passenger vessels, safeguard the health and comfort of the emigrants, and protect them against fraud and imposition. The Commission began this work at a time when some definite governmental action was an imperative necessity. The emigration trade was irregular; ships did not sail on fixed schedules; conditions on board were, in general, neither healthy nor comfortable. The Board was created to see to it that those who chose to leave the United Kingdom for new lands did so "in a manner consistent with humanity, safety and comfort"; it carried over to a time when the emigrant trade was established on a regular basis; ships followed definite schedules; passengers were no longer liable to long, costly and irksome

delays; vessels were specially designed for passenger service, and were larger, roomier and more comfortable. And finally, the iron steamship by 1872 had almost entirely driven the slower, irregular, wooden sailing vessel out of the passenger field. This last was probably the most important factor in the great transformation which took place in the emigrant trade in the generation between 1840 and 1872, but some of the credit must go to the Emigration Commissioners and their officers. In brief they had "bridged the gap" from irregularity to fixed schedules, from poor food, cramped quarters, disease and insanitation, to a prescribed dietary scale, more spacious accommodations, and strict supervision of health and sanitation, from lack of control to careful superintendence. By 1873 there was no longer need for separate control of the emigrant traffic, and that duty was entrusted to the Board of Trade as a part of its general duty of supervising merchant shipping.

3. The Commissioners were appointed in 1840 to serve as "the connecting link between the disposal of Crown lands and the conveyance of immigrants," and for the next seventeen years they were engaged in expending for the various colonies the funds designated by imperial law for the promotion of immigration. They prepared schemes of emigration, selected persons for free passages, chartered ships, appointed surgeons and matrons, and drew up regulations for discipline and health on board ship. The grant of constitutions to the Australian colonies, surrendering to them control of their own lands and revenue, marked the turning-point in this branch of the Board's work. New Zealand and South Australia lead the way by appointing their own immigration agents, followed by New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria, the Cape of Good Hope and Natal. Most of these colonies, however, continued for some time to use the Board to charter the ships they needed and sometimes to select the emigrants, but by 1872 the activities of the Board in the field of government emigra-

tion had almost entirely ceased. The Colonial Reformers had demanded that the proceeds of land sales be applied to the promotion of emigration; the Board had to a large degree answered that demand and had carried on until the colonies took over the work for themselves.

4. The Commissioners helped to bridge another gap. They were created at a time when the former slave colonies were urgently in need of a larger supply of labor to maintain their prosperity, soon to be further threatened by Free Trade. The Board aided in the establishment of a great system of labor importation from Africa, India and China, and then supervised, regulated and to some extent participated directly in the conduct of the trade.

5. Upon colonial land matters the Board served as the advisory bureau—"clerks of reference"—for the Colonial Office. The Commissioners examined and reported upon all colonial land legislation, advising the Colonial Office what action should be taken by the Crown; they investigated and prepared settlements of land claims, advised upon all matters relating to land policy, and negotiated and signed leases for guano islands, coal mines, whale fisheries, etc. They examined a great volume of colonial legislation, particularly of an economic nature, referred to them by the Colonial Office, and studied and reported upon schemes of emigration, and colonial projects of one kind and another. In brief it would be correct to say that during the years 1840 to 1878 the Colonial Land and Emigration Board was the economic bureau of the Colonial Office. The latter attended to the political matters, but there were few matters of economic importance relating to the colonies which were not referred to the Commissioners, and upon which the Colonial Office did not act as they advised.

What is the significance of the Colonial Land and Emigration Board in the colonial policy of this period? It seems to the writer that the history of the Board illustrates what might be called the "transitional statesmanship" of the years between

the Great Peace and the first Colonial Conference. In 1839 the Colonial Reformers were very active in their campaign for an entirely new, or a radical change in the old, colonial policy. That agitation could no longer be ignored; some concessions must be made, not only to satisfy the Reformers but to preserve the integrity of the Empire. The creation of the Board was part of the answer; it was not the whole Reform program, but it was a partial recognition of it.

In 1840 emigration was regarded as primarily a "home" concern—to relieve distress—, and secondly as a colonial boon —to settle the newly-acquired lands overseas. As the years passed the first concept began to fade, and attacks upon the Commissioners then became frequent in parliament: emigration is the concern of the colonies alone, let them, therefore, bear *all* the expense. The Australian colonies in 1853-55 had helped support this view. When they criticized the Commissioners for the type of emigrants sent out, was it not a principle against which they were protesting, rather than the actual practice? The colonies supplied the money for this particular emigration, why should they not have the right to control it?[1]

In 1840 Lord Durham and his followers, and all statesmen down to 1852, were agreed that the imperial government should retain control of the Crown lands in the colonies, holding them in trust for the Empire as a whole and not for the benefit of one small section of the Empire. So it was an imperial bureau that bore the title "Colonial Land," and handled the expenditure of half the proceeds from the sale of those lands. By 1856, however, the imperial government had been forced to grant to the Australian colonies the right already granted to the Canadas—control of the waste lands. After that date, indeed, the Board is referred to simply as the "Emigration Commission," although technically the full title remained.

[1]Certainly the close connection between the emigration protests and the purely constitutional protests in the case of New South Wales (*vide supra*) lends color to this view.

In other words the fate of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission was bound up in the struggle for responsible self-government. In 1840 the Colonial Office still ruled the Empire; so lands were retained for the imperial government; so emigration was to be controlled by that government. But as the colonies sought for and won the right to administer their own affairs, the fate of the Commission was sealed. When, in 1856, the principle was recognized that the waste lands belonged to the colonial, not the imperial, government, the direct participation of the Commissioners in colonial lands and emigration was doomed to end. The colonies voted their own immigration funds, appointed their own agents, and yet—a tribute to the Commissioners' work—did not immediately dispense with the services of the imperial officials. By 1869, however, the last of the Australian colonies, Victoria, had carried self-government to that logical end.

The Colonial Land and Emigration Board had done its work; it had carried over, in two fields of colonial policy, from the views of 1840 to the grant of colonial autonomy. The finest tribute to the Commission is to be found in the words of one of the Colonial Office officials: "a Department which has of late lost its importance only because its work has been accomplished."[2]

[2]C.O. 384/121. February 22, 1878. R. Meade was at this time one of the Under-Secretaries; he later became Permanent Under-Secretary.

APPENDICES

and

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

The Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners

Thomas Frederick Elliot .....10 January 1840—27 November 1847
Robert Torrens .....10 January 1840—(19 July 1841)
Edward Ernest Villiers .....10 January 1840—30 October 1843
John George Shaw-Lefevre .....19 July 1841—19 May 1846
Charles Alexander Wood .....28 November 1843—2 June 1857
Frederic Rogers (Lord Blachford).....19 May 1846— May 1860
Thomas William Clinton Murdoch.....27 November 1847—31 December 1876
Stephen Walcott .....21 July 1860—31 March 1878

APPENDIX 2

Date	Prime Minister	Colonial Secretary	Under-Secretaries	
			Parliamentary	Permanent
1830, Nov.	Grey	Goderich	Visct. Howick	R. W. Hay
1833		Stanley	J. S. Lefevre	
1834		Spring-Rice	W. E. Gladstone	
1834, July	Melbourne	"		
1834, Dec.	Peel	Aberdeen		
1835, April	Melbourne	Glenelg	Sir Geo. Grey	
1836				Jas. Stephen
1839		Normanby	H. Labouchere	
1839, Sept.		Russell	R. V. Smith	
1841, Sept.	Peel	Stanley	G. W. Hope	
1845, Dec.		Gladstone	Lord Lyttleton	
1846, July	Russell	Grey	Benj. Hawes	
1847				H. Merivale
1852, Feb.	Derby	Pakington	Sir F. Peel	
1852, Dec.	Aberdeen	Newcastle		
1854, June		Sir G. Grey		
1855, Feb.	Palmerston	Herbert	John Ball	
1855, May		Russell		
1855, July		Molesworth		
1855, Nov.		Labouchere		
1857			C. S. Fortescue	
1858, Feb.	Derby	Stanley	Earl of Carnarvon	
1858, May		Bulwer-Lytton		
1859, June	Palmertson	Newcastle	C. S. Fortescue	Sir F. Rogers
1864, April		Cardwell		
1865, Nov.	Russell		W. E. Forster	
1866, June	Derby	Carnarvon	C. B. Adderley	
1867, March		Buckingham		
1868, Dec.	Gladstone	Granville	W. Monsell	
1870, July		Kimberley		
1871			K.-Hugessen	R. G. W. Herbert
1874, Feb.	Disraeli	Carnarvon	J. Lowther	
1878, Feb.		Hicks-Beach	Earl Cadogan	
1880, April	Gladstone	Kimberley		

The Assistant Under-Secretaries were T. F. Elliot (1847-1868), F. R. Sandford (1868-1870), R. G. W. Herbert (1870-1871), H. T. Holland (1871), R. H. Meade (1870-1874), W. R. Malcolm (1874-1878), P. Pauncefote (1874-1876), J. Bramston (1876-1897).

APPENDIX 3

Reports of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners, 1840-1872

1840	6 August	1840	Pp.	5 (folio)	(613)
1842	30 July	1842		21 (folio)	(567)
1843	23 August	1843		85 (octavo)	(621)
1844	2 April	1844		98	(178)
Fifth	20 March	1845		97	(617)
Sixth	30 April	1846		132	(706)
Seventh	30 April	1847		135	(809)
Eighth	17 May	1848		152 & maps	(961)
Ninth	17 May	1849		159	(1082)
Tenth	3 April	1850		210	(1204)
Eleventh	2 May	1851		86	(1383)
Twelfth	6 May	1852		232	(1499)
Thirteenth	21 April	1853		176	(1647)
Fourteenth	27 April	1854		267	(1833)
Fifteenth	30 April	1855		208	(1953)
Sixteenth	7 April	1856		174	(2089)
Seventeenth	27 April	1857		167	(2249)
Eighteenth	8 May	1858		259	(2395)
Nineteenth	21 May	1859		241	(2555)
Twentieth	23 April	1860		197	(2696)
Twenty-First	30 April	1861		169	(2842)
Twenty-Second	2 May	1862		220	(3010)
Twenty-Third	5 May	1863		216	(3199)
Twenty-Fourth	26 April	1864		218	(3341)
Twenty-Fifth	29 April	1865		354	(3526)
Twenty-Sixth	8 May	1866		179	(3679)
Twenty-Seventh	29 April	1867		127	(3855)
Twenty-Eighth	27 April	1868		94	(4024)
Twenty-Ninth	4 May	1869		200	(4159)
Thirtieth	25 June	1870		182	(c.196)
Thirty-First	2 May	1871		138	(c.369)
Thirty-Second	30 April	1872		178	(c.562)
Thirty-Third	30 April	1873		216	(c.768)

Note: (1) The first fifteen reports were titled "General Report of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners"; beginning with the sixteenth the words "Colonial Land and" were omitted. (2) The Report for 1840 is signed by Elliot and Villiers; those for 1842 and 1843 by Elliot, Villiers and Lefevre; those for 1844 and 1845 by Elliot, Lefevre and Wood; the Sixth by Elliot and Wood; the Seventh by Elliot, Wood and Rogers; the Eighth to Sixteenth by Murdoch, Wood and Rogers; the Seventeenth to Twentieth by Murdoch and Rogers; and the Twenty-First to Thirty-Third by Murdoch and Walcott. The Report was addressed to the Colonial Secretary each year. (3) The numbers in brackets are those of the Parliamentary Papers. (4) Beginning with the Report for 1843 the number of pages is that of the octavo edition.

APPENDIX 4

THE COLONIZATION CIRCULARS, 1843-1873

"Colonization Circular Issued by Her Majesty's Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners"

No.	Date	Price	Pages
1	13 May 1843	4d.	16
2	21 July 1843	4d.	17–30 & map
3	30 October 1843	4d.	33–48
4	May 1844	4d.	16
5	February 1845	2d.	16
6	March 1846	2d.	16
7	March 1847	2d.	22
8	26 August 1848	2d.	24*
9	14 February 1849	2d.	24
9	31 July 1849	2d.	24†
10	March 1850	2d.	24
11	April 1851	2d.	28
11	July 1851	2d.	28†
12	February 1852	3d.	32
12	June 1852	3d.	32†
13	March 1853	3d.	36
14	May 1854	3d.	38
15	April 1855	3d.	36
16	April 1856	2d.	47
17	April 1857	2d.	53
18	May 1858	2d.	64
19	May 1859	6d.	74
20	1861	6d.	98‡
21	1862	6d.	107
22	1863	6d.	119
23	1864	6d.	127
24	1865	6d.	132
25	1866	6d.	138
26	1867	6d.	144
27	1868	6d.	149
28	1869	6d.	146
29	1870	6d.	148
30	1871	6d.	173
31	1872	6d.	192
32	1873	6d.	210

Note:—*Ninth edition. †Second edition. ‡Numbered, in error, as 21.

APPENDIX 5

Sums Voted by Parliament for Emigration Purposes

1819	12 July	£50,000
1821		68,760
1823	24 June	15,000
1825	14 June	30,000
1827	28 May	20,480
1834	12 May	1,457/15
1835	17 July	1,666
1836	11 August	1,874/5
1837	28 June	2,664/16/3
1838	28 July	3,871/16/3
1839	6 August	3,540
1840	12 June	3,540
1841	8 June	(sums continued)
1842	18 July	5,092
1843	25 April	11,286
1844	31 May	11,282
1845	29 July	10,495
1846	21 July	10,364
1847	1 June	23,815
1848	22 August	13,451
1849	4 June	13,654
1850	23 July	13,296
1851	15 July	25,331
1852	10 June	14,083
1853	24 May	17,396
1854	27 June	£16,840
1855	9 May	16,720
1856	16 April	14,582
1857	7 July	13,424
1858	13 July	12,828
1859	30 July	12,708
1860	18 August	11,472
1861	17 July	10,090
1862	14 June	10,834
1863	29 June	6,720
1864	18 June	7,720
1865	12 June	10,531
1866	11 May	7,418
1867	22 July	8,036
1868	6 July	9,231
1869	30 July	9,500
1870	1 August	8,545
1871	15 August	7,345
1872	18 June	7,410
1873	13 May	4,429
1874	2 June	4,460
1875	5 August	4,176
1876	12 June	4,017
1877	18 July	1,742

Note:—The votes of 1819 and 1821 were for an emigration to the Cape of Good Hope; that of 1823 for an emigration from South Ireland to the Cape and the Canadas; that of 1825 for emigration from South Ireland to the Canadas; that of 1827 for emigration from the United Kingdom; those for 1834-1839 were for the agents for emigration; and those for 1840 to 1877 were for the Colonial Land and Emigration Board, the Emigration Officers at the ports, and for certain expenses connected with emigration.

APPENDIX 6

Emigration from the United Kingdom, 1815-1880

Year	U.S.A.	B.N.A.	Australia & New Zealand	Destination not stated	Total
1815	1,209	680		192	2,081
1816	9,022	3,370		118	12,510
1817	10,280	9,797		557	20,634
1818	12,429	15,136		222	27,787
1819	10,674	23,534		579	34,787
1820	6,745	17,921		1,063	25,729
1821	4,958	12,955	320	384	18,617
1822	4,137	16,013	875	279	21,304
1823	5,032	11,355	543	163	17,093
1824	5,152	8,774	780	99	14,805
1825	5,551	8,741	485	114	14,891
1826	7,063	12,818	903	116	20,900
1827	14,526	12,648	715	114	28,003
1828	12,817	12,084	1,056	135	26,092
1829	15,678	13,307	2,016	197	31,198
1830	24,887	30,574	1,242	204	56,907
1831	23,418	58,067	1,561	114	83,160
1832	32,872	66,339	3,733	196	103,140
1833	29,109	28,808	4,093	517	62,527
1834	33,074	40,060	2,800	288	76,222
1835	26,720	15,573	1,860	325	44,478
1836	37,774	34,226	3,124	293	75,417
1837	36,770	29,884	5,054	326	72,034
1838	14,332	4,577	14,021	292	33,222
1839	33,536	12,658	15,786	227	62,207
1840	40,642	32,293	15,850	1,958	90,743
1841	45,017	38,164	32,625	2,786	118,592
1842	63,852	54,123	8,534	1,835	128,344
1843	28,335	23,518	3,478	1,881	57,212
1844	43,660	22,924	2,229	1,873	70,686
1845	58,538	31,803	830	2,330	93,501
1846	82,239	43,439	2,347	1,826	129,851
1847	142,154	109,680	4,949	1,487	258,270
1848	188,233	31,065	23,904	4,887	248,089
1849	219,450	41,367	32,191	6,490	299,498
1850	223,078	32,961	16,037	8,773	280,849
1851	267,357	42,605	21,532	4,472	335,966
1852	244,261	32,873	87,881	3,749	368,764
1853	230,885	34,522	61,401	3,129	329,937
1854	193,065	43,761	83,237	3,366	323,429
1855	103,414	17,966	52,309	3,118	176,807
1856	111,837	16,378	44,584	3,755	176,554
1857	126,905	21,001	61,248	3,721	212,875
1858	59,716	9,704	39,295	5,257	113,972
1859	70,303	6,689	31,013	12,427	120,432
1860	87,500	9,786	24,302	6,881	128,469
1861	49,764	12,707	23,738	5,561	91,770
1862	58,706	15,522	41,843	5,143	121,214
1863	146,813	18,083	53,054	5,808	223,758
1864	147,042	12,721	40,942	8,195	208,900
1865	147,258	17,211	37,283	8,049	209,801

Year	U.S.A.	B.N.A.	Australia & New Zealand	Destination not stated	Total
1866	161,000	13,255	24,097	6,530	204,882
1867	159,275	15,503	14,466	6,709	195,953
1868	155,532	21,062	12,809	6,922	196,325
1869	203,001	33,891	14,901	6,234	258,027
1870	196,075	35,295	17,065	8,505	256,940
1871	198,843	36,671	12,227	8,694	252,435
1872	233,747	32,205	15,876	13,385	295,213
1873	166,730	29,045	25,137	7,433	228,345
1874	113,774	20,728	52,581	10,189	197,272
1875	81,193	12,306	34,750	12,426	140,675
1876	54,554	9,335	32,196	13,384	109,469
1877	45,481	7,720	30,138	11,856	95,195
1878	54,694	10,652	36,479	11,077	112,902
1879	91,806	17,952	40,959	13,557	164,274
1880	166,570	20,902	24,184	15,886	227,542

SUMMARY

	1815-39	1840-72	Totals
N. Amer. Colonies.....	499,899	956,748	1,456,647
United States	417,765	4,487,497	4,905,262
Australia & N. Z.	58,449*	958,077	1,016,526
All other places.....	7,114	175,736	182,850
	983,227	6,578,058	7,561,285

(* for *1825*-39 only)

The above statistics for the years 1815-1872 are from Report 33, Appendix 1. For 1873-1880 they are from Page, *Commerce and Industry,* II. 30-31. The figures given in Page for the years 1867-1872, inclusive, do not agree with those of the Commissioners; the former give only emigrants of British origin, while the latter include all emigration from the United Kingdom, both British and foreign.

Most of those whose destination was not stated went to the Cape of Good Hope.

APPENDIX 7

POPULATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM, 1811-1881

Years	England & Wales	Scotland	Ireland	Total
1811	10,164,256	1,805,864	5,937,856	17,907,976
1821	12,000,236	2,091,521	6,801,827	20,893,584
1831	13,896,797	2,364,386	7,767,401	24,028,584
1841	15,914,148	2,620,184	8,196,597	26,730,929
1851	17,927,609	2,888,742	6,574,278	27,390,629
1861	20,066,224	3,062,294	5,798,967	28,927,485
1871	22,712,266	3,360,018	5,412,377	31,484,661
1881	25,974,439	3,735,573	5,174,836	34,884,848

(From Page, II. 1.)

APPENDIX 8

SUMMARY OF SHIPPING AND PASSENGERS, 1852-1872
(Based on Report 33, Appendix 20)

Years	Ships chartered by the Emigration Commissioners				Private Passenger Ships from Ports under the Superintendence of Government Emigration Officers				Passenger Ships not under the Superintendence of Government Emigration Officers				Remarks
	No. of Ships	Passengers	Ships Lost	Lives Lost	No. of Ships	Passengers	Ships Lost	Lives Lost	No. of Ships	Passengers	Ships Lost	Lives Lost	Crews included in "lives lost"
1852	97	34,095	1		2,111	317,641	3	51	184	14,679	2	14	
1853	84	27,723			2,189	292,130	11	459	174	8,394			
1854	127	40,570			702	243,598	6	760	121	8,180	3		
1855	88	28,016	2	543	702	122,753	4	315	31	3,934			
1856	64	20,974			462	131,306	7	672	35	3,257			
1857	71	24,893			535	164,471			39	3,573			
1858	48	17,900			400	77,556	5	180	48	3,465			
1859	52	17,978	1		370	82,040	1	417	18	963	1	1	
1860	33	9,536			354	88,788			5	1,103			
1861	16	4,596			286	60,818	1	—	5	618			
1862	30	9,223			379	90,344	2	235	2	294			
1863	38	11,710			547	184,467	2	355	4	974			
1864	31	9,684			508	178,423	1	49	3	529			
1865	28	8,986			480	181,945	2	233	1	1,255†			
1866	18	6,138			476	166,264	2	698	1	872			†1,163 of these were—
1867	12	4,272			442	169,606			—	251*			*On vessels which had previously cleared at Glasgow.
1868	10	3,179			425	172,041			1	765			
1869	6	1,905			496	234,864			3	2,489			
1870					455	233,797			2	1,974			
1871					571	229,347			—	856*			
1872					637	270,940	2	4	—	438*			
Totals	853	281,378	4	543	13,527	3,693,139	49	4,428	677	58,863	6	15	
%			.46%	.17%			.36%	.1%			.88%	.02%	

Total: Ships 15,057. Wrecked 59 (.39%). Total passengers (crews included): 4,741,669. Lost 4,986 (.1%).

APPENDIX 9

Summary of Emigration conducted by the Emigration Commissioners at the expense of Public Funds during the twenty-six years from 1847 to 1872, both inclusive. (Based on Report 33, Appendix 10).

I. Government Emigrants

Colony	Total Souls	Statute Adults	Deaths on Voyage	English	Scotch	Irish	Foreigners	No. of Ships	Amount of Tonnage	Remarks
New South Wales..	107,523	94,235	1,608	50,783	10,649	46,072	19	336	298,200	
Queensland	9,112	8,270	124	2,715	1,730	4,667		29	24,260	
Victoria	118,757	103,039	2,313	54,140	27,100	37,438	79	352½	315,637	
South Australia	78,868	67,448	1,350	50,754	8,905	19,209		264½	194,837	
Western Australia .	5,477	4,830½	44	2,681	204	2,592		32	19,969	
Tasmania	4,981	4,273½	53	1,656	575	2,750		20	12,182	
New Zealand	839	708	12	659	50	130		2	1,679	
Cape of Good Hope	12,251	10,554	149	6,663	2,080	3,434	74	47	33,059	
Natal	2,280	1,879	7	1,687	394	199		20	7,100	
Falkland Islands ...	211	179½	—	51	151	9				
Totals	340,299	295,416½	5,660	171,789	51,848	116,500	172	1,103	903,923	

II. Miscellanfous Passengers

New South Wales..	227	194½	1	227				1	1,220	Artillerymen
Victoria	5	4½	—	5						"
Western Australia .	21	16½	—	21						Surveyors, soldiers and families
Tasmania	3	2½	1	3						Artillerymen
New Zealand	779	600	25		(not distinguished)			3	1,761	Military Pensioners
Nova Scotia	350	350	—	—			350			Soldiers of German Legion
British Columbia ..	7	5	—	2	5					Family of military engineers
St. Helena	2	1½	—	2						Soldier's wife and child
Natal	31	31	—	31						Policemen
East Indies	6,647	4,931½	600	2,232	609	1,042	2,764*	18	18,571	Wives and families of soldiers in India
Ceylon	7	7	—	7						Sappers
Falkland Is.	119	93	—		(not distinguished)			1	579	Military Pensioners
Totals	8,198	6,237	627	2,530	614	1,042	4,012†	23	22,131	
Grand Totals	348,497	301,653½	6,287	174,319	52,462	117,542	4,184†	1,126	926,054	

Note: * not distinguished; † of these totals 3662 were not distinguished, and the remainder foreigners.

APPENDIX 10

ANALYSIS OF EMIGRATION CONDUCTED BY THE EMIGRATION COMMISSIONERS AT THE EXPENSE OF COLONIAL FUNDS, 1840-1872

(Based on Reports 23-33, Appendices)

Year	Total Ships	Total Emigrants	New South Wales	Victoria	Queensland	South Australia	Western Australia	Cape of Good Hope	Natal
1840 to 1846	151	30,854*	214			2,263	420	—	—
1847	17		966	Included in New South Wales up to 1 July 1851	Included in New South Wales up to 1 December 1859	3,113	51	151	
1848	73		12,203			5,686	50	402	
1849	83		13,845			5,416	75	1,342	
1850	31		4,089			2,476	252	1,073	
1851	45		3,947	2,704		4,343	121		
1852	97	34,095	7,413	20,313		5,037	629		
1853	84	27,723	7,002	13,569		5,334	887		
1854	127	40,570	11,879	15,907		10,324	443		
1855	88	28,016	11,600	6,418		9,947	19		
1856	64	20,974	8,686	7,683		4,174	96		81
1857	71	24,893	8,919	12,829		3,240	314	231	
1858	48	17,900	6,496	5,504		3,712	198	2,034	174
1859	52	17,978	4,838	2,034		1,316	418	4,051	66
1860	33	9,536	2,930	1,873	300	1,003	303	1,384	365
1861	16	4,596	865	1,307	1,128	4	68	1,035	339
1862	30	9,223	3,078	1,502	1,952	1,066	572	500	422
1863	38	11,710	4,858	2,309	1,144	1,700	186		225
1864	31	9,684	3,739	801	2,279	2,600	211	23	182
1865	28	8,986	1,991	487	1,469	4,848	136	21	64
1866	18	6,138	1,031	735	558	3,097	114	2	68
1867	12	4,272	682	3,363		349	106		108
1868	10	3,179	520	2,787			140		132
1869	6	1,905	6	1,886		73	69		8
1870			106				10		
1871			277				6		
1872	13	520	465				10		

*Of these all but 6,453 (36 ships) were bounty emigrants.

In addition to the colonies listed above Tasmania received some 4,984, New Zealand 1,618, and Falkland Islands 330 emigrants.

APPENDIX 11

INDIAN (COOLIE) EMIGRATION TO THE MAURITIUS ISLANDS

(Based on Report 33, Appendix 14)

Years	Ships	Coolies	Years	Ships	Coolies
1843	157	31,258	1858	87	29,946
1844 Jan. 1 – Mar. 31	43	9,060	1859	120	44,397
			1860	40	13,286
1844 Apr. 1 – Dec. 31	20	5,092	1861	44	13,985
			1862	33	9,893
1845	44	10,285	1863	17	5,254
1846	27	6,789	1864	24	7,575
1847	26	5,729	1865	56	20,283
1848	21	5,303	1866	16	5,596
1849	30	7,282	1867	—	—
1850	38	9,823	1868	6	1,886
1851	37	9,771	1869	6	1,682
1852	61	16,796	1870	13	4,076
1853	40	12,144	1871	11	3,292
1854	61	18,516	1872	18	5,773
1855	43	12,915	1843–1845 Chinese		843
1856	42	12,653			
1857	38	12,725	Totals	1,216	353,908

NOTE: In 1843 and up to March 31, 1844, the emigration was conducted under the bounty system; after April 1, 1844, it was conducted by Government Officers alone.

APPENDIX 12

Emigration to the British West Indies

Years	From the East Indies					From China			African Emigration to British Guiana
	British Guiana	Trinidad	Jamaica	Other Colonies	Total	British Guiana	Other Colonies	Total	
1835-1842	406				406				3,022
1843-1856	22,346	10,569	4,550		37,465[5]	647	1,460[2]	2,107	8,024
1857	2,596	1,414		283[1]	4,293				
1858	1,404	2,083		362[1]	3,849				281
1859	3,426	3,363		854[2]	7,643	699		699	
1860	5,450	2,169	598	660[3]	8,877	1,942		1,942	625
1861	3,737	2,544	1,523	597[4]	8,401	3,368		3,368	40
1862	5,625	1,603	1,982	1,724[5]	10,934	2,590	467[1]	3,057	558
1863	2,354	1,801	542		4,697	296		296	373
1864	2,709	949			3,658	509		509	390
1865	3,216	2,759			5,975	1,691	1,067[3]	2,758	42
1866	2,526	473		474[6]	3,473	789	597[1]	1,386	
1867	3,909	3,267	1,625	477[7]	9,278				
1868	2,528	1,367			3,895				
1869	7,168	3,329	1,393	343[7]	12,233				
1870	4,943	1,892	906		7,741				
1871	2,706	1,508	1,355	594[6]	6,163				
1872	3,550	3,607	1,525		8,682				
Totals	80,599	44,697	15,999	6,368	146,663	12,631	3,591	16,222	13,355

Notes: [1]To Grenada; [2]To Grenada and St. Lucia; [3]To St. Lucia; [4]To St. Vincent and St. Kitts; [5]To Grenada, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent; [6]To Grenada and St. Vincent; [7]To St. Vincent.

Notes: [1]To Trinidad; [2]To Trinidad and Jamaica; [3]To Trinidad and Honduras.

EMIGRATION FROM SIERRA LEONE AND ST. HELENA TO BRITISH WEST INDIES

	Jamaica		Trinidad		Grenada		St. Lucia		St. Vincent		Tobago		St. Kitts		Total
	Sierra Leone	St. Helena	Sierra Leone	St. Helena	Sierra Leone	St. Helena	Sierra Leone	St. Helena	Sierra Leone	St. Helena	Sierra Leone	St. Helena	Sierra Leone	St. Helena	
1843-1856	2,552	2,632	2,474	2,292	972	85	551	568	234	575	46	246	95	137	13,459
1858				30											30
1859				4											4
1860		47	226	470		92				94					929
1861	390	259				122				119					890
1862		608				57		179		14		225			1,083
1863		533				114							223		870
1867		11													11
Totals	2,942	4,090	2,700	2,796	972	470	551	747	234	802	46	471	318	137	17,276

SUMMARY OF EMIGRATION TO BRITISH WEST INDIES, 1835-1872

From East Indies	146,663	From Madeira	34,364
Sierra Leone	21,118	B. W. I.	31,336
St. Helena	9,513	China	16,222

[NOTE: This table is based on Report 33, Appendix 11.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Guides, Indexes and Catalogues

Scargill-Bird, S. R., *A Guide to the Various Classes of Documents preserved in the Public Record Office.* Third edition, London, 1908.

Giuseppi, M. S., *A Guide to the Manuscripts preserved in the Public Record Office.* Two volumes, London, 1923-1924.

Parker, David W., *A Guide to the Documents in the Manuscript Room at the Public Archives of Canada.* Ottawa, 1914.

Fee, Norman, *Catalogue of Pamphlets, Journals and Reports in the Public Archives of Canada, 1611-1867.* Second edition, Ottawa, 1916.

Adam, Margaret I., Ewing, John, and Munro, James, *Guide to the principal Parliamentary Papers relating to the Dominions, 1812-1911.* Edinburgh, 1913.

(Jones, Hilda Vernon), *Catalogue of Parliamentary Papers, 1801-1900 with a few of earlier date.* London, n. d.

Williams, Judith Blow, *A Guide to the Printed Materials for English Social and Economic History, 1750-1850.* Two volumes, New York, 1926.

Griffin, A. P. C., *List of Books (with references to periodicals) relating to the Theory of Colonization, Government of Dependencies, Protectorates and Related Topics.* Washington, 1900; second edition, 1900.

Classification of Parliamentary Reports, and a Breviate of their Contents: likewise Tables of Arrangement in Volumes of the Accounts and other Papers, and Bills, 1801-1826. P.P. 27 February 1830; 81.

Catalogue of Parliamentary Reports, and a Breviate of their Contents: arranged under Heads according to the Subjects, 1696-1834. P.P. 15 August 1834; 626.

Indexes to the Subject Matters of the Reports of the House of Commons, 1801-1834. P.P. 15 August 1834; 626A.

Catalogue of Parliamentary Reports, arranged under Heads according to the Subjects, 1835 to 1837. In continuation of the Catalogue, 1696 to 1834. P.P. 10 July 1837; 498.I.

Indexes to the Reports of Commissioners, 1828-1847. (Emigration.) P.P. 21 July 1847; 710.I.

Indexes to Reports of Commissioners, 1812-1840. (Colonies.) P.P. 21 July 1847; 710.IV.

General Index to the Accounts and Papers, Reports of Commissioners, Estimates, &c., &c. Printed by Order of the House of Commons, or Presented by Command: 1801-1852. P.P. 16 August 1853.

Note: In the above P.P. indicates Parliamentary Paper; the date is when the Paper was ordered to be printed, and the number is that of the Paper.

II. Manuscripts

1. The most important sources for this subject are to be found in the Public Record Office in the Colonial Office (C.O.) series of manuscripts. Two series in particular relate to the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission. C.O. 384 consists of the original correspondence to the Colonial Office upon Emigration, the bulk of it coming from the Commission. Upon these letters are to be found the minutes of the C.O. officials, and, generally, drafts of the replies sent. C.O. 386 consists of the papers of the Commission—volumes of their letter books, correspondence, minutes, printed papers, and a partial file of the *Colonial Gazette*. There are over 300 volumes in these two series. C.O. 428 and 485 are entry-books and registers of C.O. correspondence relating to emigration, coolies, etc. In addition to these much material is to be found in other C.O. series, as for instance C.O. 13 and 385.

2. In the Public Archives of Canada, at Ottawa, much valuable manuscript material is also to be found. Series G consists of the correspondence from the Colonial Secretary to the Governor-General. The material, of course, relates particularly to the

Canadian part of the Commission's work, but there is also considerable material of a general nature.

III. Official Publications

General Reports of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners, 1840-1873. (For complete list see Appendix 3.)

Colonization Circular issued by Her Majesty's Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners, 1843-1873. (See Appendix 4.)

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.

First Series, 1803-1820; vols. 41
Second " , 1820-1830; " 25
Third " , 1830-1891; " 356.

The Journal of the House of Commons, 1819-1880. Vols. 74-135.

The Statutes of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Tables of the Revenue, Population, Commerce, &c., of the United Kingdom, and its Dependencies, 1834-1880.

The Reports made for the year to the Secretary of State having the Department of the Colonies: in continuation of the Reports annually made by the Governors of the British Colonies, with a view to exhibit generally the Past and Present State of Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions. Transmitted with the Blue Books for the Year Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty, 1846- .

Information published by His Majesty's Commissioners for Emigration, respecting the British Colonies in North America. London, 1832.

Information for Emigrants to British North America. Second edition. Published by Authority. London, 1842.

Vancouver's Island. Survey of the Districts of Nanaimo and Cowichan Valley. London, 1859.

Information respecting Free and Assisted Passages to the Colonies. Information for Emigrants proceeding in Ships despatched by the Emigration Commissioners. London, 1863.

(Note: The last three items were published by the Emigration Commissioners.

To give a complete list of all the Parliamentary Papers consulted would require many pages; in the following list are included only the more important Papers containing material bearing upon the subject. In each instance the date of publication and number of the Paper are given.)

First Report from the Select Committee on the Subject of the Disturbed Districts in Ireland, now under the Provisions of the Insurrection Act. 1824; 35.

Emigration. Report of Commissioners. 1832; 724.

Report from His Majesty's Commissioners for inquiring into the Administration and Practical Operation of the Poor Laws. 1834; 44.

*First (*to *Fourteenth) Annual Report of the Poor Law Commissioners for England and Wales.* 1835-1848.

*Poor Law Board. First (*to *twenty-third) Annual Report.* 1848-1871.

Emigration. Copies of any General Report, since the last laid before this House, from the Agent General for Emigration. 1839; 536.I.

Appendix to. 1839; 536.II.

Colonial Land Board. No. 1.—Copies of the Commission appointing T. F. Elliot and Robert Torrens, Esquires, and the Honourable Edward E. Villiers, Land and Emigration Commissioners. No. 2.—Of the Instructions addressed by Lord John Russell to the Land and Emigration Commissioners. No. 3.—Of a Commission revoking the existing Commission of the South Australian Commissioners, and appointing Robert Torrens and T. F. Elliot, Esquires, and the Honourable Edward E. Villiers, Colonization Commissioners for South Australia. 1840; 35.

First Report from the Select Committee on Emigration, Scotland; together with the Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix. 1841; 182.

Correspondence relative to Emigration to Canada. 1841; c.298.

Despatch from the Governor-General of British North America, transmitting the Annual Reports of the Agents for Emigration in Canada for 1841. 1842; c.373.

Copies of Reports made to the Governors and Councils of Canada, New Brunswick and New South Wales, by the Emigration Agents of those Colonies. 1843; 71.

Copies or Extracts of any Correspondence relative to Emigration, which has taken place since the date of the last despatches which were laid before Parliament, for each of the Colonies respectively. Copies or Extracts of any Correspondence relative to the Sale of Colonial Lands. 1843; 291.

Copy or Extract of a Despatch from the Governor-General of Canada, transmitting the last Annual Report of the Agent for Emigration. 1844; 181.

Papers relative to Emigration to the British Provinces in North America. 1847; c.777.

Further Papers in continuation of above. 1847; c.824. 1847-8; 50. 1848; c.932. 1848; c.964. 1848; c.971. 1848; c.985. 1849; c.1025. 1849; 593. 1851; 348. 1852; c.1474. 1853; c.1650. 1854; c.1763. 1855; 464. 1857; 14. 1857 (Sess. II); 125. 1858; 165. 1859 (Sess. II); 218. 1860; 606. 1861; 186. 1862; 355.

First (Second and Third) Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Colonization from Ireland; together with the Minutes of Evidence. 1848; 46.I., II., and III.

Reports of Committees of Inquiry into Public Offices and Papers connected therewith. 1854.

Returns for the Years 1860, 1861, and 1862, and the first six months of 1863, showing the number of Emigrants who left

the United Kingdom for the United States, British North America, the several Colonies of Australasia, South Africa, and other Places respectively; of Emigration for the years 1815 to 1863 (first six months) in continuation of Appendix I. to the Emigration Commissioners' Reports; and, Copy of the last Memorandum issued by the Emigration Commissioners relative to Free and Assisted Passages to the Colonies. 1863; 430.

Report from Sir Clinton Murdoch, K.C.M.G., to Sir Frederic Rogers, Bart., K.C.M.G. (dated 5th August 1870), on the Subject of Emigration. 1871; c.296.

Correspondence respecting Emigration. 1871; c.235.

Hand Book for Emigrants to the Province of New Brunswick, ...compiled from Returns in the Office of the Provincial Secretary. Fredericton, 1841.

Dominion of Canada. Information for Intending Emigrants. Published by the Government of Canada. Ottawa, 1873.

IV. Printed Materials

The Colonial Gazette. A Weekly Journal. "Ships, Colonies, and Commerce." Volumes 1-4; London, 1838-1842.

The Colonial Magazine and Commercial-Maritime Journal. (Edited by Robert Montgomery Martin, Esq.) Volumes 1-8; London, 1840-1842.

The Colonial Magazine, and Commercial-Maritime Journal. Volumes 1-4; London, 1842-1843.

Fisher's Colonial Magazine and Journal of Trade, Commerce, and Banking. New Series. Volumes 1-2; London, 1844-1845.

Adderley, C. B., *Review of "The Colonial Policy of Lord J. Russell's Administration," by Earl Grey, 1853; and of subsequent Colonial History.* London, 1869.

Aspinall, Algernon E., *The British West Indies: Their History, Resources and Progress.* Boston, 1912.

Belcher, E. A., and Williamson, James A., *Migration within the Empire.* New York, 1924.

Bodelsen, C. A., *Studies in Mid-Victorian Imperialism.* New York, 1925.

Brabazon, Lord, *State-Directed Colonization: its Necessity.* London, (1886).

Brees, S. C., *A Key to the Colonies; or, Advice to the Million upon Emigration; for the use of all classes: containing illustrations of the right kind of persons to emigrate, and how they should set about it, with anecdotes of the class that ought to stop at home.* London, 1851.

Bronkhurst, H. V. P., *The Colony of British Guyana and its Labouring Population.* London, 1883.

Buer, M. C., *Health, Wealth, and Population in the Early Days of the Industrial Revolution.* London, 1926.

Buller, Charles, *Systematic Colonization. Speech of . . . in the House of Commons, on Thursday, April 6, 1843.* London, 1843.
Responsible Government for Colonies. London, 1840 (reprinted in Wrong, *Buller,* q. v.).

Burn, John Ilderton, *Familiar Letters on Population, Emigration, and Home Colonization; to which are now added some Introductory Letters on Labour, &c.* Second edition, London, 1838.

Caldecott, Alfred, *English Colonization and Empire.* London, 1897.

Campbell, Persia Crawford, *Chinese Coolie Emigration to Countries within the British Empire.* London, 1923.

Carrothers, W. A., *Emigration from the British Isles. With special reference to the development of the Overseas Dominions.* London, 1929.

Clementi, Cecil, *The Chinese in British Guiana.* N.p., 1915.

Cowan, Helen I., *British Emigration to British North America, 1783-1837.* Toronto, 1928.

Currey, C. H., *British Colonial Policy, 1783-1915.* Oxford, 1916.

Duval, M. Jules, *Histoire de l'Emigration européenne, asiatique et africaine au XIXe siècle. Ses causes, ses caractères, ses effets.* Paris, 1862.

Egerton, Hugh Edward, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy.* London, 1905.

The Colonial Reformers of 1830. (See Hearnshaw.)

Epps, William, *Land Systems of Australia.* London, 1894.

Fiddes, Sir George V., *The Dominions and Colonial Offices.* New York, 1926.

Finch, John, *The Natural Boundaries of Empires; and a new view of Colonization.* London, 1844.

Garnett, R., *Edward Gibbon Wakefield. The Colonization of South Australia and New Zealand.* London, 1898.

Gonnard, René, *L'Emigration européenne, au XIXe siècle.* Paris, 1906.

Gooch, G. P. (editor), *The Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1840-1878.* Two volumes, London, 1925.

Greswell, William Parr, *Outlines of British Colonisation.* London, 1893.

The Growth and Administration of the British Colonies, 1837-1897. London, 1898.

Grey, Earl, *The Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration.* Two volumes, London, 1853.

Hale, Edward E., *Letters on Irish Emigration.* Boston, 1852.

Harrop, A. J., *The Amazing Career of Edward Gibbon Wakefield.* London, 1928.

Hearnshaw, F. J. C. (editor), *King's College Lectures on Colonial Problems.* London, 1913.

Hocken, T. M., *The Early History of New Zealand.* Wellington, N. Z., 1914.

Hodder, Edwin, *George Fife Angas. Father and Founder of South Australia.* London, 1891.

The History of South Australia, from its Foundation to the Year of its Jubilee, with a Chronological Summary of all the Principal Events of Interest up to Date. Two volumes, London, 1893.

Ireland, Alleyne, *Tropical Colonization. An Introduction to the Study of the Subject.* New York, 1899.

Jenks, Edward, *The History of the Australasian Colonies from their Foundation to the Year 1893.* Cambridge, 1895.

Johnson, Stanley C., *A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America, 1763-1912.* New York, 1914.

Knaplund, Paul, *Gladstone and Britain's Imperial Policy.* London, 1927.

"Mr. Oversecretary Stephen." *(The Journal of Modern History;* Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 40-66; 1929.)

Knowles, L. C. A., *The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire.* London, 1924.

The Industrial and Commercial Revolutions in Great Britain during the Nineteenth Century. Fourth edition, London, 1926.

Laing, Samuel, *National Distress; its Causes and Remedies.* London, 1844.

Legoyt, A., *L' Emigration européenne: son importance, ses causes, ses effets, avec un appendice sur l'Emigration Africaine, Hindoue et Chinoise.* Paris, 1861.

Leroy-Beaulieu, Paul, *De la Colonisation chez les Peuples Modernes.* Deux tomes; cinquième edition, Paris, 1902.

Lucas, Sir Charles (editor), *Lord Durham's Report on the Affairs of British North America.* Three volumes; Oxford, 1912.

Lyttleton, Lord, *A Letter to the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, secretary to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, on the Principles of the Operations of the Society, especially with regard to Emigrants.* London, 1849.

Marais, J. S., *The Colonisation of New Zealand.* London, 1927.

Marindin, George Eden (editor), *Letters of Frederic Lord Blachford, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies 1860-1871.* London, 1896.

Maxwell, Sir Herbert, *The Life and Letters of George William Frederick, Fourth Earl of Clarendon, K.G., G.C.B.* Two volumes; London, 1913.

Merivale, Herman, *Lectures on Colonization and Colonies. Delivered before the University of Oxford in 1839, 1840, and 1841.* New edition; London, 1861.

Mills, Arthur, *Systematic Colonization.* London, 1847.
Colonial Constitutions: an outline of the Constitutional History and existing Government of the British Dependencies; with schedules of the Orders in Council, Statutes, and Parliamentary Documents relating to each Dependency. London, 1856.

Mills, Richard Charles, *The Colonization of Australia (1829-1842). The Wakefield Experiment in Empire Building.* London, 1915.

Morehouse, Frances, "The Irish Migration of the 'Forties." *(American Historical Review;* XXXIII. 579-592; 1928.)

Morris, Henry C., *The History of Colonization from the earliest times to the present day.* Two volumes; New York, 1908.

Nash, Richard West, *Stray Suggestions on Colonization.* London, 1849.

Page, William (editor), *Commerce and Industry.* (Volume I.—*A Historical Review of the Economic Conditions of the British Empire from the Peace of Paris in 1815 to the Declaration of War in 1914, based on Parliamentary Debates.* Volume II.—*Tables of Statistics for the British Empire from 1815.)* Two volumes; London, 1919.

Proper, E. E., *Colonial Immigration Laws.* New York, 1900.

Rivington, Alex., *In the Track of our Emigrants. The New Dominion as a Home for Englishmen.* London, 1872.

Rolph, Thomas, *Emigration and Colonization; embodying the results of a mission to Great Britain and Ireland, during the years 1839, 1840, 1841, and 1842; including a correspondence with many distinguished noblemen and gentlemen, several of the governors of Canada, etc.; descriptive accounts of various parts of the British American Provinces; with observations, statistical, political, etc.* London, 1844.

Rusden, G. W., *History of New Zealand.* Three volumes; London, 1883.
History of Australia. Three volumes; London, 1883.

Siegfried, André, *Edward Gibbon Wakefield et sa doctrine de la Colonisation systématique.* Paris, 1904.

Smith, Sidney, *The Settler's New Home: or the Emigrant's Location, being a guide to emigrants in the selection of a settlement, and the preliminary details of the voyage.* London, 1849.

Stanley, Lord, *Farther Facts connected with the West Indies. A Second Letter to the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. late Secretary of State for the Colonies.* Second edition; London, 1851.

(Stephen, Sir James), *Address of Sir James Stephen, on the British Colonies and Colonization, delivered in St. George's Hall (Liverpool), Wednesday, Oct. 13, 1858.* Liverpool, (1859).

Swainson, William, *New Zealand.* London, 1856.
New Zealand and its Colonization. London, 1859.

Torrens, R., *Substance of a speech delivered by Colonel Torrens, in the House of Commons, 15th February, 1827, on the motion of the Right Hon. Robert Wilmot Horton, for the re-appointment of a Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom.* London, 1828.
Colonization of South Australia. London, 1835.
The Budget. A Series of Letters on Financial, Commercial, and Colonial Policy. By a Member of the Political Economy Club. London, 1841-1843.

Postscript to a Letter to the Right Honourable Sir Robert Peel, Bart., M.P., &c., &c., on the Condition of England, and on the Means of removing the Causes of Distress. London, 1843.

Traill, Mrs. C. P., *The Female Emigrant's Guide, and Hints on Canadian Housekeeping.* Toronto, 1854.
The Canadian Settler's Guide. Fifth edition; Toronto, 1855.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, *England and America. A Comparison of the Social and Political State of both Nations.* New York, 1834.
A View of the Art of Colonization, with Present Reference to the British Empire; in Letters between a Statesman and a Colonist. London, 1849. (Reprinted with an introduction by James Collier; Oxford, 1914.)
The Founders of Canterbury. Volume I. Being Letters from the late Edward Gibbon Wakefield to the late John Robert Godley, and to other well-known helpers in the Foundation of the Settlement of Canterbury in New Zealand. Christchurch, 1868.
A Letter from Sydney the Principal Town of Australasia: and Other Writings on Colonization. London, 1929.

(Ward, H. G.), *The Debate upon Mr. Ward's Resolutions, on Colonization, in the House of Commons, June 27, 1839, containing the Speeches of H. G. Ward, Esq., M.P., Sir W. Molesworth, Bart., M.P., Rt. Hon. Henry Labouchere, M.P., W. Warburton, Esq., M.P., and Right Hon. Viscount Howick, M.P. Corrected by the several speakers.* London, 1839.

Wentworth, W. C., *A Statistical Account of the British Settlements in Australia; including the Colonies of New South Wales and Van Dieman's Land. . . .* Two volumes; third edition; London, 1824.

Westgarth, William, *Australia Felix; or, a Historical and Descriptive Account of the Settlement of Port Phillip, New South Wales; including full particulars of the manners and condition of the aboriginal natives, with observations on emigration,*

on the system of transportation, and on colonial policy. Edinburgh, 1848.

Wilcocks, James B., *Emigration, its Necessity and Advantages; with a brief account of the principal Australian Colonies.* (London, 1848.)

Williamson, James A., *A Short History of British Expansion.* Second edition in two volumes; London, 1930.

Wright, Arnold, *The Romance of Colonisation: being the Study of the Economic Development of the British Empire.* London, 1923.

Wrong, E. M., *Charles Buller and Responsible Government.* Oxford, 1926.

Emigrant's Guide; being the information published by His Majesty's Commissioners for Emigration, respecting the British Colonies of Upper and Lower Canada, and New Brunswick, with general Observations on the Voyage, Climate, Soil, Wages, Prices of Provisions, etc. By a Ten Years' Resident. Devonport, (1832).

Chambers's Information for the People. Conducted by William and Robert Chambers, Editors of Chambers's Edinburgh Journal, Educational Course, etc. Numbers 17-20; Edinburgh, (1841).

Memoranda of a Settler in Lower Canada; or, the Emigrant to North America. Being a Compendium of useful practical hints to Emigrants, . . . Together with an Account of every day's doings upon a Farm for a year. By an Immigrant Farmer, of twenty years experience. Montreal, 1842.

The Emigrant to North America, from Memoranda of a Settler in Canada. Being a Compendium of useful practical hints to emigrants, with an account of every day's doings upon a farm for a year. By an Emigrant Farmer of twenty years' experience. Edinburgh and London, 1844.

"Our Colonial Empire." Reprinted from the *Westminster Review* of October 1852; n.p., n.d.

The Dictionary of National Biography Founded in 1882 by George Smith, Edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. Oxford, 1921-1922.

INDEX

Adderley, C. B., 177; attacks Commissioners, 296-97, 298-300, 302-303.
African emigration to West Indies, 243-49.
Agent-General for Emigration, *vide* Elliot.
Alfred, clerk in Commissioners' office, 67, 68, 85, 89, 92n.
Annual Reports, 84, 104-09.
Argentine Republic, cautions *re,* 102, 109, 111-13.
Austin, emigration agent in China, 259-62.
Australian colonial emigration agents, 79, 80, 82; (*vide* also various colonies).
Australian gold rush, 78, 187, 191, 192, 205, 208-09, 213-14, 216, 218-219.

Bourchier, Capt., emigration officer, 169, 176-77, 179.
Brazil, cautions *re,* 113-14.
British Columbia, 276.
British Guiana, 92, 243, 245-50, 252-64.
British North America, 100, 250-251; pamphlet *re,* 97-98.
Brownrigg, Capt., emigration officer, 168, 169.
Buller, Charles, 8, 31-33, 35, 122-23, 284, 286-87, 288, 290.

Canada, Upper and Lower, 50, 114, 200.
Cape of Good Hope, and Agent-General, 26; and Commissioners, 51, 101, 199, 208; government emigration to, 229-31.
Cardwell, Edward, Colonial Secretary, defends Commissioners, 300, 301.
Carew, Lieut., emigration officer, 163, 164, 165, 173.
Carnarvon, Lord, Colonial Secretary, 87, 88, 90, 91, 93, 94, 113, 114, 271-72.
Chant, clerk in Commissioners' office, 67, 68, 82.
Chinese emigration to West Indies, 244-45, 255-64.
Civil War, American, effect on emigration, 193-95.
Colonial Gazette, criticizes Commissioners, 282-84.
Colonial Land and Emigration Commission, negotiations preceding formation of, 37-43; the commission, 43-46; instructions, 44, 46-56; history of, Chapter III; quarters, 59-60, 75, 85-86; dispute over Port Essington, 63-64; amalgamation with S. A. Commission, 66-69; rearrangement in 1846-47, 70-72; chairman appointed, 72, 74; superannuation, 73; expansion, 75-76; contraction, 77, 78-96; Commission of Inquiry 1853, 77-78, 79; statistical department, 78; records missing, 81; Annual Report, 84, 104-09; Colonization Circular, 84, 89, 99-104; transfer of duties to Board of Trade, 86-87, 157-58, 201-02; transfer of duties to Crown Agents, 88-95, 232, 233, 254, 255, 273, 275; significance of Commission, 307-11.
Colonial Reformers, *vide* Wakefield.
Colonization Circular, 84, 89, 99-104, 105.
Colonization, experiments in, 1816, 3; 1819, 3; 1823, 3-4; 1825, 4; South Australia, 28ff.
Colonization Society, *vide* Wakefield.
Coolie, *vide* India.
Cooper, R. B., clerk in Commissioners' office, 67, 68, 76, 85, 87.
Crimean War, affects emigration, 190-91.

de Courcy, Capt., emigration officer, 170, 172, 174.
Diffusion of information, Chapter IV; circulars, etc., 97-99; Colonization Circular, 99-104, 105; General Report, 104-09; cautionary notices, 109-14; other services, 114-16, 137.
Durham's Report, 31-33.

Elliot, T. F., secretary to Commission of 1831-32, 12-14; Agent-General for Emigration, 21-28, 38ff., 52ff., 56, 123; Commissioner, 43-46, 59-73, 282-83, 287;

chairman, 71, 72; Assistant Under-Secretary in Colonial Office, 73, 167-68.
Ellis, Commdr., emigration officer, 164, 166, 175.
Emigrants' Information Office, 116, 117.
Emigration Commission of 1831-1832, 9-14.
Emigration Committee of 1826-27, 4-5.
Emigration, government, Chapter VIII; *vide* also under various colonies; types of, 203, 208; control and conduct of, 204-07; outline of, 207-12; artisans and pensioners, 233.
Emigration officers, first appointment of, 15-20, 122; under Agent-General, 26-27; duties of, 159; under Commissioners, Chapter VI; transferred to Board of Trade, 176; 115, 124, 126-27, 136.
Engelbach, A. H., clerk in Commissioners' office, 60, 68, 76, 84, 85, 87, 89, 90, 92n., 93.
Equador, caution *re*, 110.

Falkland Islands, 92, 95, 98, 211; government emigration to, 232-33.
Falkland Islands Company, 274-75.
Fitzgerald, Capt., emigration officer, 166, 172.
Forrest, Lieut., emigration officer, 17, 27, 162, 165, 179.
Forster, John I., emigration officer, 169, 170, 173, 176, 179.
Fortescue, Charles, Parliamentary Under-Secretary, defends Commissioners, 297-300.
Frere, Capt., emigration officer, 173, 176.
Friend, Lieut., emigration officer, 17, 27, 161, 172, 179.

Gill, clerk in Commissioners' office, 82, 85, 87, 89, 93.
Gladstone, W. E., Colonial Secretary, 71, 121, 236.
Glenelg, Lord, Colonial Secretary, 21, 26, 27, 38, 291.
Gliddon, clerk in Commissioners' office, 67, 68, 82.
Goderich, Lord, Colonial Secretary, 10, 13, 14, 36.
Granville, Lord, Foreign Secretary, 112, 113; Colonial Secretary, 199, 287n.
Grenada, 92, 249, 250, 254.
Grey, Earl, (Viscount Howick), Colonial Under-Secretary and Secretary, 9, 10, 34, 132, 140, 141-43, 148-49, 163, 167-68, 178, 208, 216-17, 236-39, 248, 282; defends Commissioners, 291-92.
Guano licenses, 272-73.

Hawes, B., Parliamentary Under-Secretary, defends Commissioners, 289-90, 293, 294.
Hemmans, Lieut., emigration officer, 17, 27, 162; dismissed, 163.
Henry, Lieut., emigration officer, 17, 27, 160, 162, 170, 178-79.
Hicks-Beach, Sir Michael, Colonial Secretary, 94.
Hodder, Lieut., emigration officer, 17, 27, 162, 164-65, 167-68, 179.
Horton, Rt. Hon. Wilmot, 3, 4, 10, 35.
Howick, Viscount, *vide* Grey, Earl.
Hudson's Bay Company, 275-76.
Huskisson, Wm., 5, 8, 36.

India, coolie emigration to Mauritius, 235-41; coolie emigration to West Indies, 243, 251-55; negotiations *re* coolie emigration to French colonies, 264-66.
Indian Mutiny, effect on emigration, 191-92.
Irish famine, 71, 164, 182-85; and the Passengers Acts, 129-30; 133-39.

Jamaica, 92, 245-47, 250, 252-55.

Keele, Capt., emigration officer, 169, 173, 176.
Kerr, Capt., emigration officer, 167, 171, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179.
Kimberley, Lord, Colonial Secretary, 83, 85, 89, 201-02.

Labouchere, Henry, Parliamentary Under-Secretary and Secretary, 34, 80; defends Commissioners, 295, 296.
Labuan coal leases, 273, 274.
Lands, colonial, regulations of 1831, 9; Waste Lands Committee of 1836, 20, 21; Durham Report, 31-33; establishment of Commis-

sion, 40; Commissioners' instructions *re,* 49-52; 83; sale of by Commissioners, 267-68; review of legislation by Commissioners, 268-70.
Lean, Capt., emigration officer, 19, 27, 160, 161, 168, 170, 175, 178.
Lefevre, J. G. S., S. A. Commissioner, 30n., Emigration Commissioner, 65-69; resignation 69, 69n.
Legislative review, lands, 268-70; general, 270-72.
Lewes, J. S., clerk in Commissioners' office, 68, 76, 82.
London Emigration Committee, 14, 21, 53n.
Low, Lieut., emigration officer, 16, 27, 160.
Lynch, Richard, emigration officer, 17, 27, 110, 165, 179.

Macfie, Mr., M. P., advocates enlarging Commission, 303-06.
Madeira, emigration to West Indies, 249-50.
Makeham, clerk in Commissioners' office, 67, 68, 85, 89, 92n.
Mauritius, 92, 101; Indian emigration to, 235-41.
Merivale, H., Permanent Under-Secretary, 73-82, 240, 241, 255, 272.
Miller, Lieut., emigration officer, 17, 27.
Mills, Arthur, attacks Commissioners, 290-91; defends them, 299.
Monsell, W., Parliamentary Under-Secretary, defends Commissioners, 301-03.
Mountcashell, Lord, 141-43.
Murdoch, T. W. C., life sketch, 73n.; Commissioner, 73-92, 199-200, 270, 271, 272, 293; resignation, 87-92; mission to Canada and U. S. A., 278-80.

Natal, 92, 95, 211; government emigration to, 231, 232; land, 269, 270.
Nevis, 92.
New Brunswick, 50, 100, 200.
Newcastle, Duke of, Colonial Secretary, 78, 188, 189, 249, 260, 298.
Newfoundland 50, 271, 272.
New South Wales, and Commission of 1831-32, 12; 19; and Agent-General, 22-25, 51, 54; and Commissioners, 66, 101, 102, 199, 204, 208, 210, 211, 225; government emigration to, 215-18; land, 269.
New Zealand, 51, 101, 102, 199; government emigration to, 227-229; land, 268, 269.
New Zealand Company, 206, 207, 227, 268.
Nova Scotia, 50, 200.

Pakington, Sir John, Colonial Secretary, 170, 177; defends Commissioners, 295.
Paraguay, caution *re,* 111.
Parliament, criticism of Commissioners in, 285-306.
Passengers Acts, Chapter V; Commissioners' instructions *re,* 55, 119; transferred to Board of Trade, 83-87, 157, 158; act of 1803, 119, 120; of 1817, 120; of 1825, 120, 121; of 1828, 121; of 1835, 121, 122; of 1842, 127-31; of 1847, 131-33, 136, 137; of 1848, 138, 139; of 1849, 139-41; of 1851, 143, 144; of 1852, 144-145; of 1855, 145-47, 152-55; of 1863, 155, 156; of 1870, 156, 157; Mountcashell's complaints, 141-143; negotiation with U. S. A. *re,* 145, 156, 189, 190, 278, 279; emigration depots and hospitals, 147-51.
Patey, Capt., emigration officer, 147, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 173, 174.
Pinnock, J. D., emigration officer, 15, 19.
Poor Laws and emigration, 14, 15, 100, 186.
Port Essington, 40, 63, 277, 278.
Pownall, clerk in Commissioners' office, 82, 85, 89, 93.
Prince Edward Island, 50.
Prior, Lieut., emigration officer, 164, 169, 175, 179.

Queensland, 199, 204, 210, 211; government emigration to, 221, 222.

Ramsay, Lieut., emigration officer, 26, 27, 166, 179.
Ramsden, George, emigration officer, 165, 166, 173.

Rogers, Frederic, (Lord Blachford), in Colonial Office, 70, 71; Commissioner, 69-82; negotiations in Paris, 264, 265, 278; Permanent Under-Secretary, 82, 279, 280.
Rowlatt, Commdr., emigration officer, 166, 167, 172, 174.
Russell, Lord John, Colonial Secretary, and establishment of Commission, 37ff.; and Commission, 60ff.; defends Commissioners, 285, 286, 289, 290; 287n.

St. Helena, *vide* Africa.
St. Kitts, 249, 254.
St. Lucia, 249, 254.
St. Vincent, 92, 249, 250, 254.
Saunders, Lieut., emigration officer, 166, 169, 174, 175.
Schomberg, Capt., emigration officer, 170, 175.
Shuttleworth, Lieut., emigration officer, 19, 27, 164, 166, 179.
Sierra Leone, *vide* Africa.
Smith, E. H., emigration officer, 164, 166, 171, 175.
Smith, R. V., (Lord Lyveden), and establishment of Commission, 37ff.; and Commission, Chapter III, 288-90.
South Australia, 49n., 51, 100, 101, 199, 204, 208, 210, 271; S. A. Commissioners, 28-31, 37ff., 53n., 56, 57, 206; dismissal of, 42, 43; new commission, 43-45, 47, 66; abolition of separate Commission, 66-69; government emigration to, 212-15.
Spooner, Mr., M. P., attacks Commissioners, 295.
Stanley, Lord, Colonial Secretary, 15, 16, 18, 67, 106, 107, 127, 161, 162, 239, 251, 255, 256, 259; defends Commissioners, 286, 287.
Starke, Lieut., emigration officer, 27, 170, 179.
Stephen, James, Permanent Under-Secretary, and Agent-General, 21, 30n.; and establishment of Commission, 37ff., 57; and Commissioners, 62-73, 132, 163.
Stoll, Commdr., emigration officer, 172, 174, 176, 179.
Tasmania, and Commission of 1831-32, 12; and Agent-General, 22-25; and Commission, 51, 95, 199, 204, 225; government emigration to, 222-24; land, 269.
Texas, caution *re*, 109f.
Torrens, Robert, 28, 29, 29n., 70n.; S. A. Commissioner, 30, 39-42, 56; Emigration Commissioner, 43-46, 59-65, 282, 283; dispute over Port Essington, 63, 64; resignation, 64, 65.
Trinidad, 92, 95, 245, 246, 247, 249, 250, 252, 253, 254, 255, 257, 259, 262, 263, 264.

Vancouver Island, 233, 234, 276.
Van Diemen's Land, *vide* Tasmania.
Venezuela, caution *re*, 111.
Victoria, 92, 102, 199, 200, 204, 209, 210, 211, 216; government emigration to, 218-21.
Villiers, E. E., Commissioner, 43, 43n., 46, 59-69, 282, 287; death, 69.

Wakefield, E. G., 5-8, 11, 20, 50n., 57, 206; his "system," 7-8; and South Australia, 28, 29; and Durham mission, 31; criticism of Commissioners, 281, 282.
Walcott, Stephen, secretary to Commission, 60, 61, 68, 74; Commissioner, 82-96, 275; resignation, 93-96.
Walpole, John, assistant to Agent-General, 27; in Commissioners' office, 60, 68, 82.
Ward, H. G., 20, 33, 34, 39; attacks Commissioners, 285, 286.
West Indies, *vide* various colonies.
Western Australia and Agent-General, 26; and Commissioners, 51, 92, 95, 199, 204, 211; government emigration to, 224-27; abolition of transportation to, 226; legislation, 271.
White, emigration agent in China, 256-59.
Williams, W., attacks Commissioners, 294, 297, 299.
Wood, C. A., Commissioner, 69-79, 271; retired, 79.